

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. IX.—No. 34.

APRIL, 1933.

## WALTER HILTON AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *CLOUD OF UNKNOWING*

By HELEN L. GARDNER

THE problem of the authorship of the *Cloud of Unknowing* and its attendant treatises has, so far, resisted solution. But, recently, the claims of Walter Hilton have been brought forward by various scholars working on the period. His claim has been most fully stated by Dom Justin McCann in the *Ampleforth Journal*, July 1924. In the same year Dom McCann also edited the *Cloud* for the Orchard Series,<sup>1</sup> but in the Introduction he contented himself with saying that "Hilton's claim, though not without its plausibility, has not won any acceptance" and referred his readers to the article in the *Ampleforth Journal*.

Dom McCann's arguments in favour of Hilton's authorship may be summarised as follows :—

1. The text of the *Cloud* in MS. Douce 262, c. 1500, is annotated throughout with references to Hilton's *Scale of Perfection*, the annotator assuming that the *Cloud* and the *Scale* are both the work of Hilton.
2. The general background of scholarship is the same in both the *Scale* and the *Cloud*.
3. The dialect of both works is Midland with a strong Northern colouring.

<sup>1</sup> *The Cloud of Unknowing* and other treatises by an English mystic of the fourteenth century, with a Commentary on the *Cloud* by Father Augustine Baker, edited by Dom Justin McCann, London, 1924.

4. The *Cloud* and the epistles usually connected with it are addressed to a special friend and are not intended for a wide audience, and Hilton may have varied his teaching and style in these works in order to describe and propagate a kind of mysticism not suitable for all men.

Finally, Dom McCann questioned the commonly accepted view that the *Cloud* preceded the *Scale* and marked an intermediate stage between the mysticism of Rolle and that of Hilton. He suggested that the relationship might be reversed.

In *Blackfriars*, March 1924, Dom Noetinger had put forward the following points against the claim of Hilton to the authorship:—

1. In the *Epistle of Privy Counsel*, the author refers to some of his own works, mentioning the *Epistle of Prayer*, the *Cloud of Unknowing* and *Denis Hid Divinity*. He does not refer to any of the works which have come down to us as Hilton's. The *Epistle* is the work of a man "*consummatus* in age as well as wisdom" and we must therefore assume that if Hilton wrote the *Cloud* and its attendant treatises, he must have gone on to write his other ascribed works in extreme old age, which is hardly credible.

2. The *Cloud* comes between the work of Hilton and Rolle. In chapters 45 and 48, there occur references to the *Calor* and *Canor* of Rolle, while the greater fierceness of Hilton against heretics seems to show that when the *Cloud* was written, heresy was a more academic question, while in Hilton's day it was a real and growing danger.

3. The author of the *Cloud* was a priest, since in chapter 75, he gives the reader his blessing; but he was not a religious, as the passage in chapter 10 shows.<sup>1</sup>

4. The description of a crown in the *Epistle of Discretion* is not applicable to the English crown of the period, but it would

<sup>1</sup> The passage in chapter 10 runs as follows: "neuerþeles in þee and in al opere þat han in a trewe wyll forsakyn þe world (and ert oblishyd vnto ony degree in deuout lyuynge in holy chyrche. what so it be pryue or apeert. And þerto þat wyll be rewlyd not after her owyn wyll and þeir witt but after þe will and þe counsell of þeyre souereynis what so þei be religiouse or secularis) suche a lyking . . . is but venyal synne" (MS. Royal 17, C. XXVI). Dom McCann states that the passage in brackets does not appear in any manuscript which he examined. In this manuscript a thick red line has been drawn through the bracketed passage and in MS. Harley 674 it has actually been erased. The passage may be an insertion in some manuscripts or an omission in others and it seems unsafe to base any conclusions upon it. Even if the passage is genuine it does not seem to the present writer to indicate definitely that the author himself was not a religious.

apply to the crown of France or Scotland. This would indicate that the author lived in France or Scotland, and Scotland is preferable, as it is not likely that a man living in France would write in English.

Miss Dorothy Jones, in her edition of the *Minor Works of Walter Hilton*, London, 1929, in the course of her Introduction, considers "the vexed question" of the authorship of the *Cloud*, and says that "the most important claimant to the authorship is undoubtedly Walter Hilton." She refers her readers to Dom McCann's article and adds supplementary points in favour of Hilton. She suggests that, in spite of the fact that the author of the *Epistle of Privy Counsel*, when giving a list of his works does not mention any of those ascribed to Hilton, Hilton may nevertheless be the author of both groups. She points out that the *Epistle* is addressed to an individual disciple and the author might be only mentioning those of his works which were addressed to that same disciple. She also cites many parallels between the *Cloud* group and the ascribed works of Hilton, noting particularly their common use of the English translation of Bonaventura's *Stimulus Amoris*, ascribed in some manuscripts to Hilton. Throughout her edition, she gives parallel passages from the *Cloud* group in the footnotes to Hilton's works. She also points out that one manuscript of the *Scale*, MS. Marseilles 729, written in 1498, refers to Hilton as a Doctor of the University of Paris. If he did really study at that University the fact that the description of the crown in the *Epistle of Discretion* would fit the crown of France at this time, is a point in favour of Hilton's authorship of the *Cloud* group.

The present writer considers that the balance of probabilities is against Hilton's authorship; but she is aware that the evidence is not conclusive either way and she has no other candidate for the honour to suggest. But there seems to be a need for a more extended discussion of the subject and she hopes to be able to make the main points of the question a little clearer.

The external evidence for Hilton's authorship is simply the annotations to the Douce manuscript. The contents of the manuscript are as follows:

MS. Douce 262, c. 1500.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Catalogue of the Douce Library*, Oxford, 1840, gives the date as fifteenth century. Dom McCann, *loc. cit.* p. xvii, says "about 1500," which agrees with what is known of the two scribes.

F. 1<sup>r</sup>, Liber domus salutacionis matris dei prope londonium ordinis Carthusiensis.

F. 2<sup>r</sup>, Here begynnyth the prolog of this boke wiche is called þe dyuyne cloude of unknowyng.

F. 2<sup>r</sup>-3<sup>v</sup>, prologue.

F. 3<sup>v</sup>-9<sup>r</sup>, table of chapters.

F. 10<sup>r</sup>-118<sup>v</sup>, text of the *Cloud* annotated throughout in Latin in the margin, in a different hand from the text.

F. 118<sup>v</sup>, Here endith the boke called the dyuyne cloude of unknowyng. (In the annotator's hand) Scriptor huius libri erat dominus Willelmus Tregooz professus istius domus videlicet londoniarum Cartusiensium.

F. 119<sup>r</sup>-127<sup>v</sup>, Latin Exposition of the *Mystica Theologia*.

F. 128<sup>r</sup>-132<sup>v</sup>, Bonaventura, *De Septem Gradibus Contemplacionis*.

F. 132<sup>v</sup>-133<sup>v</sup> (in a new hand), Tract, without heading, beginning:—"When a soll (soul) begynnyth to fele grace werke in hym."

F. 134<sup>r</sup>-139<sup>r</sup> Directorium quoddam breuissimum mentis in deum ad consequendam vite perfectionem fratris Henrici Herpe ordinis minorum.

F. 139<sup>v</sup>, Explicit exercitium amoris vnitiui a fratre Henrico Herp compositum ad vite perfectionem tendentibus perutilimum Directorium Conscriptumque per Dompnum andream boorde pro quo exoro in caritatis vinculo ut preces pro eo ad ihesum fundere curetis.

F. 139<sup>v</sup>, Here folowyth the pystell of privat counsell the wych dependyth uppon the clowde and of the self clowdys makying mych profitable to contemplatif men intendencyng to cum to diuine loue.

F. 153<sup>r</sup>, Explicit epistola deuotua conscripta per manum dompni andree boorde.

Important annotations are the following:

F. 34<sup>v</sup>, o hilton sanctissime magna erat humilitas tua.

F. 56<sup>r</sup>, compilatoris humilitas prout in Scala eiusdem et ceteris tractatibus.

F. 60<sup>r</sup>, a domino Waltero disce hic humilitatem.

F. 80<sup>r</sup>, verumptamen tu satis diserte de his persecutus es in libro ad anchoritam.

F. 115<sup>v</sup>, auctoris consilia sunt venerabilis hylton in Scala.

Dom McCann states<sup>1</sup> that William Tregooze, the scribe of the first half of the manuscript, died in 1514. Andrew Boorde, the scribe of the second half, was born c. 1490; he was educated at Oxford and received into the London Charterhouse, when under the right age. He was dispensed with religion in 1521, in order to become Suffragan Bishop of Chichester.<sup>2</sup> He would, then, have written the manuscript before this year, so that a date c. 1500 fits both halves of the manuscript.

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.* p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> *D.N.B.*, London, 1908, vol. 2, p. 833.



The hand in which the annotations are written is so totally different from the hand of the text, that it is impossible to state definitely whether the annotations are or are not by the scribe, since there are no points of resemblance between the two hands by which they can be compared. There is no obvious difference in date between the text and the annotations, though the Douce Catalogue says that the annotations are later. The Catalogue also differentiates between the hand of the annotator and the hand which has written the statement on f. 118<sup>v</sup>, that William Tregooze was the scribe; but Dr. H. H. E. Craster, Bodley's Librarian, who kindly examined the manuscript with the present writer, considers these to be the same. He also thinks that it is improbable that the annotator was the scribe, since he has written the scribe's name, not in the beautiful hand of the text, but in the sprawling hand of the annotations, and it is unlikely that a scribe, who was plainly a master of his art, would deface a good page by scribbling his name across the foot, when there was plenty of room to write it well.

The external evidence for Hilton's authorship is, then, simply this: that somewhere about the year 1500, probably a little later, an unknown monk of the London Charterhouse thought Hilton to be the author of the *Cloud* as well as of the *Scale*.

The value of such an ascription coming from the London Charterhouse, about this date, is, in the present writer's opinion, seriously impaired by the following considerations:

1. An examination of the manuscripts of the *Scale* reveals that, at the end of the fifteenth century, there was a close connection between the Carthusian houses of London and Schene and the Brigittine house of Syon. Lord Aldenham's copy of the 1494 edition of the *Scale* was given by John Grenehalgh, monk of Schene, to Joanna Sewell, nun of Syon, and the note he has written inside the front cover almost repeats the wording of the note on the fly leaf of MS. Harley 6579, containing the *Scale*, which belonged to the London Charterhouse. Grenehalgh also finished the text of MS. Trinity College 354, which belonged to Schene and added a colophon, dated 1499. The Harley manuscript originally contained the shorter text of Book I, and the present writer would suggest that Schene lent its copy to the London Charterhouse for them to correct their text by it, and that the additions which converted the Harley manuscript from the short to the long text were supplied from the Trinity manuscript.

The four manuscripts of the *Scale*, which are known to have belonged to these three houses, MSS. Harley 6579 (London Charterhouse), Trinity College 354 (Schene), Harley 2387 and All Souls 25 (Syon), possess, along with three other manuscripts, the longer text of Book I. Of these three, one, MS. Lambeth 472, was written in London, while the origins of the other two, MSS. Ee IV, 30 and University College 28, are unknown. This longer text, which is not found in any manuscripts earlier than the fifteenth century, the present writer regards as a glossed text and not a revision of the original. The fact that out of seven manuscripts which possess this text, five are of London origin, and four belonged to the three religious houses, whose history is linked, and who, as the manuscripts show, shared a common interest in Hilton, suggests that this text emanated from one of these houses.

2. About fifty years after the writing of the annotations in the margin of the London Charterhouse's copy of the *Cloud*, John Bale, in his *Catalogus*, stated that Hilton was a monk of the Charterhouse of Schene, and this error persisted until quite recently. Schene was not founded until 1415 and Hilton died in 1395. John Grenehalgh, the monk of Schene, in his colophon to the Trinity MS., knows that Hilton was a Canon of Thurgarton and gives the date of his death as 1395. This colophon is dated 1499. No extant manuscript throws any light upon this statement by Bale, but he must have either seen manuscript evidence or heard of tradition which connected Hilton's name with Schene. It seems probable that, although the tradition was unknown at Schene when Grenehalgh wrote, it may have arisen there later in the very natural desire to claim as a Carthusian of that famous house, one who had written so much in praise of that order.

3. The tradition that Hilton was the author of the first three books of the *Imitation of Christ*, which were circulated in England, under the title of *De Ecclesiastica Musica*, has been fully discussed by Mr. J. E. G. De Montmorency in his work on A. Kempis.<sup>1</sup> His arguments are too long to be reproduced here; but he traces the tradition back to the houses of Syon and Schene.

While it would be absurd to condemn as suspect, for these reasons, any evidence from these three connected houses, yet the fact that, in these three cases, a false tradition concerning Hilton

<sup>1</sup> J. E. G. De Montmorency, *Thomas A. Kempis, His Age and His Book*, London, 1906, pp. 139-69.

appears to originate from them, should make scholars, at least, sceptical as to the value of an anonymous ascription from one of them over a hundred years after the author's death.

A slight piece of external evidence against Hilton's authorship is the fact that in no extant manuscript do we find works by Hilton and works by the author of the *Cloud* appearing together.<sup>1</sup> Any study of medieval manuscripts shows the fondness of compilers for collecting, in one volume, the various works of an author. MS. Harley 674 is a "collected edition" of the author of the *Cloud*; while MS. Lambeth 472 contains the *Scale* along with five other works usually attributed to Hilton. The *Scale* and *Mixed Life* constantly appear in the same volume. But there is no manuscript which connects in this way Hilton and the author of the *Cloud*.

A discussion of the internal evidence is more interesting. Dom McCann's first point in Hilton's favour is that the background of scholarship is the same in both the *Cloud* and the *Scale*. This cannot be denied; but the same might be claimed of almost any two mystical works of the period. The important feature is the use made of that common background, and the author of the *Cloud*, while using the same writers as Hilton, stresses different aspects of their work.

Both writers base a great deal of their teaching upon Augustine. But Hilton is concerned not so much with the philosophical side as the practical and devotional. He uses Augustine to stress the necessity of meekness, of grace from god and of charity, and to declare the importance of the directed will. He borrows metaphors from Augustine: the lovely ending of chapter 49, with its image of Christ sleeping in the soul, as once in the ship, is from Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*; <sup>2</sup> the interpretation of the text "Noli me tangere" and the metaphor of food for children, and for grown men in chapters 30 and 31 of Book 2 are borrowed from Augustine's Commentary upon the First Epistle of St. John, <sup>3</sup> a work which

<sup>1</sup> The exception to this statement is the translation of the *Benjamin Minor*, which appears in MS. Harley 1022, along with the *Scale*. But it is far from certain that this translation is the work of the author of the *Cloud*.

<sup>2</sup> "Fides sit tecum et tecum est Deus in tribulatione. Fluctus sunt maris, turbatis in navigio quia dormit Christus. Dormiebat in navi Christus, peribant homines. Si fides tua dormit in corde tuo tanquam in navi tua Christus dormit; quia Christus per fidem in te habitat. Cum turbari coeperis, excita Christum dormientem; erige fidem tuam et noveris quia non te deserit" (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*, xc (Migne, xxxvi, 1169)).

<sup>3</sup> "Propterea et Mariam prohibebat se tangere. Quare ergo se tangi nolit, nisi quia contactum illum spirituales intellegi voluit? . . . Ille attingit de corde

Hilton uses constantly. Hilton is not interested in philosophical questions and he does not follow up the philosophical implications of the teaching he borrows. The author of the *Cloud*, on the other hand, does not use the exegetical works of Augustine, nor does he borrow metaphors or make quotations. He follows Augustine in his teaching upon such subjects as meekness and grace, but he also follows him in such matters as the discussion upon the nature of time, in chapter 4.<sup>1</sup>

Again, his discussion upon the powers of the soul in chapter 67, inspired by the *Benjamin Major*, and going back, through that, to Augustine's *De Trinitate*, though it may be paralleled in chapter 43 of the first book of the *Scale*, is more philosophical and far subtler than Hilton's treatment. Hilton merely uses the normal comparison of the soul to the Trinity and gives the usual classification of the soul into three parts, Mind, Reason and Will. The author of the *Cloud*, on the other hand, shows a real genius for rendering difficult conceptions into simple language and he is profoundly interested in the questions of the nature of the soul and the relationship between Creator and created. Hilton is merely using the commonplaces of scholastic teaching as a framework for his own; in the hands of the author of the *Cloud*, the argument is pursued and the thought developed for its own sake.

The author of the *Cloud* makes very few direct quotations from the Fathers. In the *Cloud* itself, there is one quotation from Augustine, one from Gregory, both in chapter 70, and one from Saint Denis to whom the author refers as the source of his own teaching. Hilton frequently quotes directly by name, though more often in the first than the second book of the *Scale* and Hilton also often quotes or paraphrases without acknowledging the debt.

Both Hilton and the author of the *Cloud* use constant Scriptural quotations, Hilton rather more frequently. An interesting point, whose exact significance is doubtful, is that Hilton always quotes from the Vulgate and then translates into the vernacular. In the *Cloud*, quotations are always made in the vernacular and incorporated with great skill into the fabric of the text, but this is not true of all

mundo Christum qui eum intellegit Patri aequalem." and "Lac nostrum Christus humilis est; cibus noster idem ipse Christus aequalis Patri. Lacte nutrit ut pane pascit, nam corde contingere Jesum spiritualiter est cognoscere quia aequalis est Patri" (*Epist. Joannis ad Parthos*, iii (Migne, xxxvi, 1997-98)).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Confessiones*, xi, 23, 27, 28 (Migne, xxxii, 820-26), and *De Civitate Dei*, xi, 6 (Migne, xli, 321-22).

the other epistles connected with the *Cloud*. In the *Epistle of the Discerning of Spirits*, quotations are made in the vernacular as in the *Cloud*; but, in the *Epistle of Privy Counsel*, the *Epistle of Prayer* and the *Epistle of Discretion*, quotations are from the Vulgate, with vernacular translations following. This slight difference in method might indicate that the three last-mentioned epistles were composed some years after the *Cloud* and the *Epistle of Discerning of Spirits* or it might be a point in favour of the hypothesis, which has been put forward, that the *Cloud* and its epistles were not all the work of the same man, but the product of a school of mystics.

The question of the original dialects of the *Scale* and the *Cloud* cannot be profitably discussed until critical editions of both works are published. But there is certainly no evidence in the dialect of any manuscripts of the *Cloud* for Dom Noetinger's suggestion that its author lived in Scotland.

In discussing the style of the two works, it may be noted that the author of the *Cloud* employs far more alliteration than Hilton does and that his sentences also tend to be much shorter and his points are more sharply made. He uses metaphor and simile briefly, while Hilton loves to expand a metaphor, sometimes for a whole chapter.

But the most striking feature of the two groups of work is the extraordinary similarity of phrasing in them. The *Scale* and the *Cloud* contain often identical metaphors, phrases and almost sentences.<sup>1</sup> The similarity of thought is also remarkable. Hilton and the author of the *Cloud* echo each other's teaching on perfect and imperfect meekness (*Cloud*, c. 13, *Scale*, ii, 20, 37); on the necessity of meditations upon the Humanity of Christ as the way to contemplation (*Epistle of Privy Counsel*, c. 9; *Scale*, i, 35, 92;

<sup>1</sup> "It is bot a sodeyn steryng . . . speedly springing unto god; as sparcle fro the cole" (*Cloud*, c. 4).

"perfore ilk a worde þat it pryualy preieþ is like to a sparcle spryngende out of a fire bronde" (*Scale*, ii, 42).

"Sey þou þat it is god þat þou woldest haue. him I coueite hire I seche and noȝt bot him" (*Cloud*, c. 7).

"Answer ay þus. I am noȝt. I coueite noȝt bot only þe loue of ihesu" (*Scale*, ii, 22).

"þe lorde is not only porter hymself; bot also he is þe dore" (*Epistle of Privy Counsel*, c. 9).

"fore crist is dore and he is porter" (*Scale*, i, 92).

Numerous examples as striking as these could be found throughout the works of the two authors.

Quotations from the *Cloud* are given from MS. Harley 674, unless otherwise stated; those from the *Scale* are from MS. Harley 6579; abbreviations are expanded.

ii, 30); and they repeat each other's warnings against the misunderstanding of spiritual teaching in a bodily way (*Cloud*, c. 51; *Scale*, ii, 33). The parallels are very frequent and extremely interesting, but more interesting still are the deep divergences between the two writers.

Hilton appears, constantly, to be using the same terms as the author of the *Cloud* in a different sense. The most important examples of this are in those chapters in the second book of the *Scale*, where he speaks of a "gode niȝt and a liȝty mirknes" (c. 24-27). But the divergences between them are apparent from the first chapter of each work. Hilton, with Augustine in mind,<sup>1</sup> begins the *Scale* with this definition of the highest part of contemplation.

þe þridde partie of contemplacion whilk is parfit as hit mai ben here. liȝt boȝe in cognicion and in affeccion. þat is for to seyen in knowyng and in parfit lufinge of god and þat is whan a mannys soule first is reformed bi fullhede of vertues. to þe ymage of ihesu. and after whanne he is visited: is taken in fro alle erþly and fleschly affecciouns. fro vayne þouȝtes and ymaginynges of alle bodili creatures and as hit were mikel ys raiusched: out of þe bodili wittes and þanne bi þe grace of þe holy gost is illumined for to see bi vnderstandyng soþfastnesse: whilk is god and gostli þinges, with a softe swete brenninde luf in him: so parfitli þat bi raiusching of lufe: þe soule is oned for þe time and confourmed to þe ymage of þe trinite (*Scale*, i, 8).

This is Hilton's first statement upon the highest part of contemplation and it stresses, as all Hilton's teaching does, the element of *cognition*. The author of the *Cloud* speaks thus:

For at þe first tyme when þu dost it. þou fyndest bot a derknes and as it were a cloude of vnknowyng. þou wost neuer what. sauynȝ þat þou felist. in þi wille a nakid entent vnto god: þis derknes and þis cloude is how so euer þou dost. bitwix þee and þi god and letteþ þee þat þou maist not see him cleerly. by liȝt of vnderstanding in þi reson: ne fele him in swetnes of loue in þin affeccion. And perfore schap þee to bide in þis derknes as longe as þou maist. Euermore criing. after him þou louest. For ȝif euer schalt þu fele him. or see him. as it may be here it behouep alweis be in þis cloude and in þis derknes (*Cloud*, c. 3).

The author of the *Cloud* goes on then to distinguish between two darknesses, the darkness of forgetting, which must be between

<sup>1</sup> The use of the Latin word *COGNITION* suggests that Hilton had in mind Augustine's definition of wisdom: "Non incongruenter intelligamus sapientiam in cognitione et dilectione eius quod semper est et incommutabiliter manet, quod Deus est" (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*, cxxxv (Migne, xxxvii, 1760)).



the soul and all created things, and the darkness of unknowing, which is above the soul and between it and its creator (c. 5). The soul hangs ever in this life between these two nights, the night of sense and the night of God; and to pass through the first and to enter the second is the contemplative's object. Mary "who chose the best part" "heng up hir loue and hir longing desire in þis cloude of unknowing and lerned hir to loue a þing.þe whiche she miȝt not se cleerly in þis liif bi liȝt of vnderstandyng in hir reson ne ȝit verely fele in swetnes of loue in hir affection" (c. 16). "For," says the author emphatically, "o þing I telle þee þat þer was neuer ȝit pure creature in þis liif.ne neuer ȝit schal be so hiȝe rauischid in contemplacion and loue of þe godheed.þat þer ne is euermore a hiȝe and a wonderful cloude of vnknowyng betwix him and his god" (c. 17).

Hilton uses the terms "darkness" and "night" in two ways. In Book 1, he uses the metaphor of a cloud to express the cloud of our corruption which hides from men the vision of God. It was in this sense that Gregory frequently used the metaphors of night and clouds, to signify the darkness of mortal corruption.

Quia, igitur, ad contemplandum interni solis radium, nubes sese nostræ corruptionis interserit nec ad infirmos nostræ mentis oculos, illud, sicut est incommutabile lumen erumpit; adhuc Deum, quasi in nocturno visione cernimus cum procul dubio sub incerto contemplatione caligamus (*Morals*, v, 35 (Migne, lxxv, 707-08)).

But in Book 2 Hilton uses the terms of night and darkness in another sense, and it is in chapters 24 to 27 of this book that he seems to be echoing the author of the *Cloud* most closely. In reality, where the wording is most similar, he is really displaying his fundamental divergence from that type of mystical experience. For, to Hilton, this darkness and night is not the final experience but a stage in contemplation and a stage which has to be passed through in this life, and he is using the terms *night*, *nought* and *darkness* not for the cloud of unknowing, but for the cloud of forgetting. This "gode niȝt and liȝty mirknes is a stoppyng out of the fals luf of þis world and it is a neiȝing to the trewe day" (ii, 24), "þis niȝt is not elles bot a forberynge." And a withdrawyng of þe pouȝt of þe soule fro erþly þinges" (ii, 24). For "þe ay lastand luf of ihesu is a trew day and a blissed liȝt.for god is boȝe luf and liȝt.and he is ay lastande and þerfore.he þat lufiþ him is in liȝt.ay lastand" (ii, 24).

"What þinge makip þis mirknes? soþly not elles bot a gracious desire for to haue þe luf of ihesu. for þat desire . . . gedrip þe soule into it self . . . and so bryngeth it in to þis riche noȝt. and soþly it is not al mirke ne noȝt . . . for ihesu þat is boþ luf and lizt is in þis mirknes. wheþer it be pinful or restful he is in þe soule as trauailand in desire and longynde to lizt. bot he is not zit as restend in luf and shewend his lizt" (ii, 24).

To Hilton then the final experience is light and he is here using the metaphor of the cloud as Richard of St. Victor had used it :

Quid enim est ad divinæ vocationis accessum, nebulam intrare, nisi mente excedere et per oblivionis nebulam quasi adjacentium memoria mente caligare? Ad idem respicit quod discipulos Christi nubes lucida obumbravit et obumbrando illuminavit, quia et illuminavit ad divina et obnubilavit ad humana (*Benjamin Major*, v, 2 (Migne, cxcvi, 191)).

This "lucida nubes" is a different experience from the "divine dark" of the pseudo Dionysius and of the author of the *Cloud*. In the *Cloud*, the final experience is of darkness pierced by sudden transient gleams of light.

þan wil he sumtyme perauenture send oute a beme of gostly lizt peersyng þis cloude of vnknowing þat is bitwix þee and hym. and schewe þee sum of his priuite. þe whiche man may not ne kan not speke. "þan schalt þou fele þine affection enflammid wiþ þe fiere of his loue. fer more þen I kan telle þee or may or wile at þis tyme (c. 26).

Hilton, using exactly the same metaphor, applies the image of beams of light piercing a cloud to an earlier stage of contemplation, not to the highest of which the soul is capable in this life.

Rizt so desire to luf ihesu feled in þis mirknes sleep alle synnes. alle fleschly affections and alle vnclene pouȝtes for þe tyme. and þan neizest þu fast to ierusalem. þou art not zit at it. bot bi smale sodeyn liztynges þat glideren out purgh smale caues fro þat citee schalt þu mown seen it fro fer. or þat þu come þerto. for wete þu wele þawȝ þat þi soule be in þis restful mirknes with outen trobling of wordly vanitees it is not zit þer it schuld be: it is not zit cloþed al in lizt ne turned al into þe fire of luf? (ii, 24).

In much the same way, Hilton appears to be advocating the same "nakid entent" toward God, which the author of the *Cloud* recommends; but he is all the while unable to separate the thought of the Being of God from the thought of His attributes. The author of the *Cloud* urges constantly that "þof al it be good to þink

onpon þe kindenes of god and to loue hym and preise him for hem.ʒit it is fer betyr to þink apon þe nakid beyng of him and to loue him and preise him for him self" (c. 5). Contemplation, to Hilton, is not a feeling of the naked being of God, a recognition reached in a flash of the "id quod est" of Augustine. He constantly reminds his readers that they must think of God in a "ghostly" way, but to have a ghostly feeling of God is to him "þat þou miȝtist knowe þe wisdom of god þe endles miȝte of our lord ihesu crist þe grete goodnes of hym'in hym self and in his creatures'for þis is contemplacion" (i, 12). Hilton declares that "a soule is a lif vndedly and vnseable and haþ miȝt in it self for to seen and knowen þe souereyn soþfastnes and for to lufen þe souereyn godnes.þat is god" (ii, 30). The highest contemplation, to Hilton, is when the soul worships and loves in understanding "ihesu god in man.souereyn soþfastnes.and souereyn godnes and blissid lif" (ii, 30).

In one passage on this point the *Cloud* and the *Scale* echo each other very closely. The author of the *Cloud* speaks of having "trewe knowyng and a felyng of god as he is.not as he is in hym self'for þat may no man do bot himself.ne ȝit as þu schalt do in blisse boþe body and soule togeders.bot as he is possible.and as he voucheþsaaf to be knowen and felid of a meek soule leuyng in þis deedly body" (c. 14). Hilton says: "(The soul) seep him not what he is.for þat may no creature done in heuen ne in erþe nor he seep him not as he is.for þat siȝt is onely in þe blis of heuen. Bot he seep him.þat he is an vnchaungeable beynge.a souereyn miȝt. souereyn soþfastnes. souereyn goodnes.a blissid lif.an endeles blis" (ii, 32). Hilton in this passage is using phrases almost identical with those in the *Cloud*, but he expands his teaching by dwelling upon God's attributes, so that the two passages superficially alike are in reality profoundly different.

Light may perhaps be thrown upon the relationship of the *Scale* to the *Cloud* by considering the religious poetry of Vaughan and Herbert. At their supreme best, no one could mistake the work of one of these poets for that of the other. Herbert, like Hilton, writes of a Love, which bids the soul welcome. His poetry, like the *Scale*, is inspired by the "wonderful homeliness of Jesu." While Vaughan writes as does the author of the *Cloud*, three hundred years earlier, of "God's silent searching flight." As in the *Cloud*, Vaughan's night has two meanings; it is both:

Dear Night, this world's defeat,  
 The stop to busy fools, care's check and curb;  
 The day of spirits, my soul's calm retreat  
 Which none disturb;

and it is also, the cloud of unknowing, the revealing darkness of God.

There is in God—some say—  
 A deep but dazzling darkness, as men here  
 Say it is late and dusky, because they  
 See not all clear.  
 O for that Night, where I in Him  
 Might live invisible and dim.

This is Vaughan's secret, just as Herbert's is :

"let my shame  
 Go where it doth deserve."  
 "And know you not," says Love, "who bore the blame?"  
 "My dear, then I will serve."  
 "You must sit down," says Love, "and taste my meat."  
 So I did sit and eat.

But in many passages Vaughan lifts metaphors and phrases directly from Herbert's works; and even in their finest and most characteristic poems, the resemblances are strong; so that, if we were to imagine that the work of both poets had come down to us anonymously and only distinguished by manuscript tradition into two volumes, we should have a problem to discuss very similar to the problem of Hilton and the *Cloud*, and the extraordinary parallels of thought and imagery might make us assume that the two writers were one and the same. Even in such great and, to us, characteristic lines of Vaughan as

I saw Eternity the other night,  
 Like a great ring of pure and endless light,  
 All calm as it was bright,

we recall Herbert's *Virtue*,

Sweet day so cool, so calm, so bright.

But to confuse these two poems would be impossible, and to the present writer it seems as impossible to confuse the *Cloud* and the *Scale*. The divergence of experience and personality in the two books seems as violent as that between the poetry of Vaughan and Herbert, while the superficial resemblances are no less remarkable between the seventeenth-century poets than between the fourteenth-century mystics. The analogy breaks down only in the point that

whereas, in the seventeenth century, it was the more original Vaughan who copied and borrowed, in the fourteenth century it was the less original and more ecclesiastical Hilton who imitated his more daring predecessor. However, though this is the established view as to their relationship, Dom McCann has questioned it and asked whether the *Cloud* may not come after the *Scale*, and this point must be discussed later.

Dom McCann's last suggestion, that since the *Cloud* and its attendant treatises were written to a special disciple, Hilton may have adapted his arguments and style to that friend and have advocated a type of mysticism not suitable to ordinary men, is rendered highly improbable by examination of the works ascribed to Hilton. Hilton's known works are by no means confined to one type of reader. If the anchoress, to whom Book I of the *Scale* was written, was unlettered, yet in the second book Hilton assumes that his reader is able to read the Scriptures. In *Mixed Life*, he writes to a worldly lord of some position and wealth; in the Latin *De Imagine Peccati* (sometimes called *De Imagine Ydoli*) he writes to a solitary; and in the *Epistola Aurea*, to Adam Horsley, a Baron of the Exchequer, about to give up the world and to enter the Carthusian Order. If Hilton were accustomed to adapt his matter to his pupils, we should expect to find him doing so in these works; but his teaching for each of these readers is the same. The only differences apparent are the greater mysticism of the English works and their superior freedom and beauty; the Latin works being comparatively unmythical expositions of theoretical contemplation.

It must be remembered also that the *Cloud* itself is apparently addressed to an unlearned man, as the annotator to MS. Douce 262 has noticed. The terms *Lesson*, *Meditation* and *Orison* are translated for him: "Or ellis to pin vnderstondyng pei mowe be clepid. Redyng, pynkyng and Preiing" (c. 35). And in chapter 70, the author states that patristic quotations would have been out of place in the work since "to pee it nedeþ not." From this the *Cloud* would seem to be addressed to much the same kind of person as the first book of the *Scale*; for our only reason for thinking Hilton's anchoress to be ignorant is that "redinge of holi writ mai (she) nou 3t wel vsen." If, then, the diversity of audience has not affected Hilton's teaching in his known works, it is surely rash to make the assumption that it might do so an argument for his authorship of the *Cloud*.

The unread Latin works of Hilton and the various less important

English works, such as the Commentaries upon psalms xc and xci, have not been sufficiently taken into account, in the discussion of this question. They reveal that the *Scale*, *Mixed Life* and *Angel's Song* are Hilton's high-water mark and that in these works we find a freedom, an originality and a freshness, which the other works do not contain. But at the same time the essentials of Hilton's teaching remain the same. Only in the *Scale*, the dead wood astonishingly puts on leaves and blossoms. To ascribe the *Cloud* and its epistles to Hilton is to ascribe to him an originality and a type of thought of which the other works give no trace. It appears to the present writer that the ascription is psychologically impossible, breaking in, as it does, upon the perfectly natural and logical development of Hilton's thought and style.

But apart from the psychological improbability, there is the practical difficulty of fitting the *Cloud* and its epistles into the Hilton Canon. The *Epistola Aurea* cannot have been written before the year 1370, since in that year Adam Horsley, to whom it was written and who is spoken of as about to enter the Carthusian Order, was still at the Exchequer.<sup>1</sup> The *Epistola* is a dry and tedious work, lacking altogether in inspiration and freshness, a mere catalogue of the points in which the religious life is superior to the secular or to the solitary and the Carthusian to all other orders. It contains almost no mystical teaching and certainly no mystical feeling. It must be among Hilton's very early works, certainly much earlier than the first book of the *Scale* and probably considerably earlier than the English commentaries upon the psalms. Hilton died in 1395, which gives us a period of less than twenty-five years into which to pack his ascribed works. These are both numerous and lengthy, the *Scale* itself being quite three times as long as the *Cloud*, which is itself longer than any treatise of Rolle's. If we accept the theory of Hilton's authorship of the *Cloud* we have to find room for it and for the *Benjamin Minor*, the *Mystica Theologia* and the four shorter epistles, and we have also to allow for a gap between the first and second books of the *Scale*, which all critics have insisted must be separated by some years and also for a gap between the *Cloud* and the *Epistle of Privy Counsel*, which as Dom Noetinger has said were certainly not written at the same period of the author's life. We should have, at any rate, to postulate either the "different audience" theory, which has been shown to be unsound, or a theory

<sup>1</sup> *Issue Roll of the Exchequer*, 44 Edward III, London, 1835, p. 405.



of conversion, which would make it possible for Hilton to have written one set of works at one stage of his life, and the other at a later. But if we accept the conversion theory, it is still impossible for the *Cloud* to have preceded the *Epistola Aurea*. The *Cloud* is the work of a master; every subject he touches upon he illuminates by his wit and the energy of his intellect. The pedestrian manner, the laboured earnestness of the *Epistola* reveals the novice in writing, the man still bound in by the shackles of the scholarly convention of the day. Our experience of conversion tells us that though much is altered more remains the same. It is incredible that the conversion to a more homely and personal type of mysticism, even if we can imagine such a thing occurring, could cause the author of the *Cloud* to abandon his intellectual subtlety and brilliance, his wit and force, and turn him to the reproduction of commonplaces and the laboured praises of a religious order. If we assume the conversion theory, the works must be crowded into the period 1370-1395, with all Hilton's known works first, allowing for some years between the early Latin works and the first book of the *Scale* and for another period between the first and second books; then would have to come another gap to allow of this sudden change, of which no gradual traces appear; then the *Cloud* and its attendant epistles would follow, with another period elapsing between the *Cloud* and the *Epistle of Privy Counsel*. The difficulty of the ascription is here made obvious, since it forces us to assume that the same man first wrote the serene and mature second book of the *Scale*, and then after a lapse of some years wrote the youthful, vivacious and vigorous *Cloud*. It seems to the present writer impossible, at any rate, to arrange such a mass of work, with a reasonable regard for probability, within so short a period as less than twenty-five years.

If we assume, however, as this discussion has tried to suggest, that it is far more likely that we are dealing with the work of two separate writers, the question of the relative dates remains. It has been assumed, on curiously little evidence, that the *Cloud* is earlier than the *Scale*. Manuscript evidence affords no help. The *Cloud* manuscripts are mainly of the fifteenth century as are those of the *Scale*. There is one, MS. Camb. Univ. II, vi, 39, which is late fourteenth-century; but none exists which is definitely earlier than Hilton's manuscripts. The translation of the *Benjamin Minor*, which is printed by Professor Horstman from MS. Harley 1022,<sup>1</sup> is said by

<sup>1</sup> Horstman, *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, London, 1895, vol. i, p. 162.

him to be "very old and certainly prior to Walter Hilton"; but he gives no reasons for this statement. Professor Edmund Gardner, who has printed it from Pepwell's collection of mystical treatises of 1521, states in his introduction<sup>1</sup> that "it is evidently by one of the followers of Richard Rolle, dating from about the middle of the fourteenth century. External and internal evidence seems to point to its being the work of the anonymous author of the *Divine Cloud of Unknowing*." But he, also, does not cite his evidence.

In the absence of external evidence the question must remain open, but the theory that the *Cloud* is intermediate between Rolle and Hilton is inherently more probable than the theory that it follows Hilton. Dom Noetinger, in the article referred to above, notes the greater fierceness of Hilton against heretics as an indication that the author of the *Cloud* lived before the time of the Lollard movement which so agitated Hilton's day. Also it may be noted that both Hilton and the author of the *Cloud* constantly use the word *sovereign* as an adjective, and that, indeed, the use of this word does serve, almost, to mark off the mysticism of the later half of the century from that of the earlier. The present writer suggests that the word may have been first introduced into the vocabulary of English mysticism by the translation of *Denis Hid Divinite*, in which it is used by the translator to render the perpetual *ὑπέρ* prefix of Dionysius, rendered in Latin by *super*. The translation is referred to as his own by the author of the *Cloud* in the *Epistle of Privy Counsel*. If, as is suggested, the translation was responsible for the popularisation of the adjective, then Hilton, who is very fond of the word, must have written after the translation was made.

The relationship of the *Cloud* and the *Scale* is so close that it can only be explained by the assumption that one writer was intimately acquainted with the work of the other. It seems more probable that Hilton was the indebted, though the case of Vaughan and Herbert makes it not impossible that the positions may be reversed. Hilton, however, appears at times, as at the close of *Angels' Song*, to be warning his readers against following too closely the teaching of the *Cloud*, just as he also warns them against a too literal interpretation of the words of Rolle.

The conclusion reached in this discussion is that it is highly improbable that Hilton wrote the *Cloud*, though the writer owns that she has no other candidate to suggest for that honour. The

<sup>1</sup> Gardner, *The Cell of Self Knowledge*, London, 1925, p. xvii.

only external evidence is valueless and the internal evidence is strongly against the hypothesis. To have to assume a complete change of personality, in order to make the theory fit, is surely a rash step, when unsupported by any convincing external evidence; while the practical difficulties in the chronology of the Hilton Canon, if he is to be credited with the *Cloud* works, are almost insuperable. The "different audience" theory, though attractive, is only a hypothesis and an improbable one, in view of Hilton's lack of adaptation of his teaching in his known works.

It is true, as Dom McCann says, that "Nature abhors a vacuum"; and that we do not like to think of any work so great as the *Cloud*, without being able to think also of its author. But to attempt to fill the vacuum with the figure of Hilton, is to make the already existing confusion worse. The two authors appear, in the present writer's opinion, to present strongly marked and different personalities, which no amount of common background or shared phraseology can disguise. Style, manner, vocabulary and imagery can be borrowed, but personality is inalienable.

## THE BACKGROUND OF SHYLOCK

By CECIL ROTH

THAT Shylock was a sheer figment of Shakespeare's imagination, there has never been any doubt. Yet this figment has acquired an objective reality more vital than that of most creatures of flesh and blood. His actions are still a byword, his name is a reproach, and his unfortunate co-religionists actually taxed sometimes with his reputed misdeeds. It was therefore natural that critics of the past generation—men of the calibre of Heine, Elze, or Brandes—persisted in regarding him as a real personality, paying homage to Shakespeare's genius when they were in Venice by visits as literary pilgrims to the Rialto and the Ghetto. To-day, on the basis of fuller information, it is not altogether futile to fill out the details of Shylock's background, and to attempt to show what manner of man he must have been had he actually lived, granted the general truth of the fictional incidents in which he figures.

For that they are fictional does not admit of any doubt. In his *Merchant of Venice*, Shakespeare as usual adapted an old story to suit his dramatic requirements. The somewhat puerile episode of the "Pound of Flesh" dates back to the thirteenth century, if not earlier. A Jew is not always the villain of the piece, however, and in one memorable instance he actually figures as the victim. In Leti's *Vita di Sisto Quinto* we are told that in 1585, when the news reached Rome that Drake had captured San Domingo, a Christian merchant named Paolo Maria Secchi wagered a thousand ducats against a pound of flesh with a Jew, Sansone Ceneda, that it was not true. The latter lost: the Christian demanded repayment: and it was only the sapience of the Pope, who anticipated Portia's decision, which brought the matter to a conclusion.

The tale was, indeed, first chronicled late in the seventeenth century; but it is not absolutely out of the question that it embodies some popular legend current contemporaneously, which may have reached Shakespeare's ears in a more or less garbled form. It may be added that the name Ceneda is a characteristically Jewish

one in Italy, though not notoriously or exaggeratedly so—a fact which makes the story all the more credible. Strangely enough, the other great Elizabethan drama in which a Jew figures has likewise an inverted parallel in history. Marlowe's "Jew of Malta" attempted to betray the island to the Turk. It was long alleged that no Jews lived there at the period, the verisimilitude of the tale thus entirely disappearing. Recent research has shown that this is not the case. But the only conspiracy known to local history in which a Jew was implicated, on whatever side, was the Turkish Plot of 1749, which was frustrated solely through the assistance given by the neophyte, Joseph Antonio Cohen.

Even the name Shylock is obscure in its Jewish connection. It is conceivable that Shakespeare derived it from "Shiloch the Babylonian" mentioned in the apocryphal Chronicle of Joseph ben Gorion, which was so popular in his day. On the other hand, it has been pointed out that all the Jewish names which occur in the *Merchant of Venice*—Shylock (Shelah), Jessica (Jesca), Chus (Cush) and Tubal—are closely paralleled in two successive chapters of the Book of Genesis (x, 2, 6, 24; xi, 14-5, 29). There is on record, moreover, a contemporary pamphlet, *Caleb Shillocke, his Prophecie, or the Jewes Prediction*, published in 1607. It is not, however, quite certain whether the nomenclature was borrowed from Shakespeare, or whether an earlier edition, as yet unrecorded, served as the latter's inspiration. In any case, as far as the Ghetto was concerned, the name Shylock was absolutely unknown; and nothing approaching it is to be found in Venetian sources, printed or manuscript. This may now be stated, for the first time, without equivocation.<sup>1</sup>

The question of nomenclature aside, it is not difficult in our

<sup>1</sup> I make this statement categorically on the authority of prolonged and detailed research done in preparation for my exhaustive *History of the Jews in Venice* (Philadelphia, 1930; Italian translation, Rome, 1932), on which other fresh information contained in the present essay is based.

It is a curious coincidence that Shakespeare happens to give both of Antonio's closest friends names which have a strong Jewish flavour. The nearest actual parallel to Bassanio is Bassano, which, in modern Italy, is considered characteristic. Similarly, Gratiano, under the form Graziano, happens to be a typically Italian Jewish name. A certain Lazzaro di Graziano Levi had collaborated with the poet Solomon Usque in writing a play on Esther. This was produced more than once in Venice in the second half of the sixteenth century, and may conceivably have been published (as a *rifacimento* of it by Leone da Modena certainly was in 1612). It would be an extraordinary flight of fact if the name of one of Shakespeare's typical Venetian Christians were actually suggested to him, in some subconscious manner, by that of a contemporary Venetian Jew and fellow-playwright!

present state of knowledge to reconstruct Shylock's actual background and to depict, without leaving much margin for error, those details which Shakespeare relegated to the imagination. Israel Zangwill pictured him as a Spanish Jew who had fled from the persecutions of the Inquisition with his mind filled with hatred against Christianity. Hunter, in 1845, asserted that he was a Levantine. As a matter of fact, both conjectures happen to be out of the question, on the author's own showing. Venetian Jewry, in Shakespeare's day and long after, was divided into three "nations," which were accorded absolutely different treatment one from another, and maintained their own separate institutions. Among these, there were, indeed, "Ponentines," comprising refugees from Spain and Portugal, and "Levantines," consisting of Turkish subjects from the Near East. More prominent than these, about the streets of the city and on the Rialto, was the *Nazione Tedesca*, or German nation. This was the oldest of all in establishment, dating from the beginning of the sixteenth century, or even earlier. Though the least wealthy of the three, it was by far the most numerous, supporting a majority of the synagogues and easily surpassing all other local elements combined. (It may be mentioned, *en passant*, that old Gobbo's inquiry for the house of "master Jew," in sixteenth-century Venice, would have been somewhat lacking in precision: and it was fortunate that he found his son to guide him.)

Now, there can be no doubt whatsoever that Shylock, had he existed, would have belonged to this "nation." The proof is very simple. He was by profession a moneylender—the whole of Shakespeare's story, indeed, turns upon this fact. But, as it happens, it was only the *Nazione Tedesca* which was allowed to practise this occupation. Both the Levantines and the Ponentines were rigorously restricted, by law, to commerce: and they controlled a great part of the maritime trade of Venice—particularly that with the Levant, which owed its prosperity to them. The so-called "Germans," on the other hand, were tolerated in Venice solely on condition of maintaining the essential money-lending establishments in which the tender conscience of the Serenissima would not allow any Christian to engage. They were not permitted to dabble in trade, however much they desired to do so: and the only occupation legally open to them beside that of money-lending was dealing in second-hand clothes. The other two categories, on the other hand, were specifically prohibited, in their periodical *condotte*, or licences, from



engaging in either of these two callings. This very strong legal differentiation between the two classes continued until the close of the seventeenth century. Hence, by the fact of his engaging in the profession of financier, and of making Antonio a loan, it is perfectly obvious that Shylock must have belonged to the *Nazione Tedesca*—the German nation.

The variety of pledges which Venetian Jews accumulated in their hands in the course of business was bewildering. All the treasures of palaces along the Grand Canal, from roof to cellar, sometimes succumbed to the magnet of the Ghetto. They were well known to have in their possession a splendid assortment of gems and jewellery, so much so that sumptuary laws were necessary to put a check on the amount worn. Shakespeare's picture of the nature and extent of Jessica's depredations in her father's house is absolutely true to life in this respect. And it would be far from unlikely that a rich Jewish moneylender would have "in readiness" among his unredeemed pledges a "page's suit," in which his errant daughter might disguise herself for the purpose of flight.<sup>1</sup> In this, as in other respects, Shakespeare's intuition has enabled him to sketch in trivial details with such remarkable fidelity as to render it quite conceivable that (as has been conjectured) he knew Italy at first-hand, from a visit with the English players in 1593.

The fact that Shylock belonged to the German "nation" does not imply that he was of German birth, or even of immediate German origin: though his relations with Frankfort, where he had bought the ring stolen by Jessica, render this hypothesis possible. The *Nazione Tedesca*, as we have seen, was the oldest in establishment of all sections of the Jewish community in Venice, dating back by Shakespeare's day for a full century. From the very beginning it had comprised, not only immigrants from across the Alps, but also native, semi-autochthonous, Italian elements: and by now it was fully assimilated to the dominant culture of the country and of

<sup>1</sup> Similarly, Ben Jonson's *Sir Politick Would-Be*, within the first week of his landing at Venice:

"I had read Contarene, took me a house,  
Dealt with my Jews to furnish it with movables"—

a characteristic profession of theirs in Venice, facilitated by their accumulations of second-hand commodities and unredeemed pledges. For a case in point, see the contemporary *Travels of Peter Wendy*, p. 92.

the city. Indeed, whereas the Levantines and Ponentines spoke Spanish or Portuguese amongst themselves, carrying on a great part of their communal business in those languages, the *Nazione Tedesca* had, for the most part, completely abandoned the last relic of their ancestral German, and used Italian for all ordinary purposes. There were, of course, some arrivals of more recent date, but the latter followed willy-nilly the fashion predominant in the Ghetto. Shylock was therefore, in all probability, a native. It is obvious, indeed, that Shakespeare did not consider him a foreigner; had he done so, the temptation of making him speak a broken English, like Dr. Caius in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, would have been irresistible.

It is true, on the other hand, that Shylock is not a citizen. Shakespeare makes this fact absolutely plain :

It is enacted in the laws of Venice  
If it be proved against an alien,  
That, by direct or indirect attempts,  
He seek the life of any citizen . . .

With reference to this crucial passage, it must be borne in mind that the Jew of the Ghetto period was considered something less than a native of the country, even if he were born there. It is remarkable, and it is perhaps something more than a coincidence, that this was nowhere given such precise juridical expression as it was in Venice. The attempts made there so consistently to exclude the Jews from economic life were based upon the assumption that the Jews were, in fact, aliens, however long they and their fathers before them had resided under the protection of the Lion of St. Marco. Indeed, as late as the last decades of the eighteenth century, it was expressly laid down in their recurrent *condotte* that "the Jews of Venice, and of the State, or any other Jew, cannot claim nor enjoy any right of Citizenship." Juridically, Shylock was therefore an alien, whether born in Venice or no.

Having thus decided upon his ancestry, it is possible to go even a little further, and to state the precise situation of "the next turning of all, on the left," where he lived. The Ghetto at Venice was a commodious area, capable of giving accommodation (with an unconscionable degree of overcrowding) to as many as five thousand souls. It consisted of streets, and alleys and squares, leading all the way from the Cannaregio to the Rio S. Girolamo. But, in Shakespeare's day, it was rigorously divided off into districts. The

"Ponentines" and the "Levantines" were supposed to live in the Ghetto Vecchio, or Old Foundry, which had been set aside as an exclusive place of residence for them in 1541. The *Nazione Tedesca* were confined to the *Ghetto Nuovo*—that same area, surrounded on all sides by water and thus easily cut off from the outside world, to which they had been first relegated in 1516 (the *Ghetto Nuovissimo*, the last extension, had not yet come into existence). It is true that the two areas were contiguous; but the two ethnic elements which inhabited them remained quite distinct. Thus, for example, when in 1586 a tide of migration set in from the crowded *Ghetto Nuovo* to the more ample Levantine quarter, the local authorities (who were responsible for seeing that the rents of all the houses, occupied or unoccupied, were punctually paid) intervened with a menace of excommunication to stop the movement; and in 1609 the assistance of the civil authorities was invoked to force the "German" Jews back into their own overcrowded district. There can be no doubt, accordingly, that Shylock, as a moneylender and therefore one of the *Nazione Tedesca*, lived in the *Ghetto Nuovo*—a broad square, with ramshackle houses seeking vertically the expansion which they were unable to obtain laterally. It should be added that, owing to the oppressive restrictions which continued to prevail until the Napoleonic era, Shylock would have got into severe trouble had he actually left the Ghetto at night to have supper with Bassanio; while Launcelot Gobbo was wise in quitting his service before his misdemeanour was known to the authorities, who sternly prohibited the employment of Christians by Jews in a subordinate capacity, under whatever pretext.

Even as to dress, it is possible to speak with a certain degree of confidence. Shakespeare presumably knew of the institution of the Jewish badge, intended to mark off the Jew for contumely from all other men. It was, indeed, all but universal in Europe in his day; and contemporary visitors to Germany or Italy or the South of France brought back detailed descriptions of it, as one of the most characteristic features of the Jewish Quarter.

One of the nineteenth-century stage Shylocks wore it in the shape of the two tables of stone. This, however, was a purely English invention, enforced in the reign of Henry III and Edward I prior to the expulsion of 1290. Other producers have preferred a yellow circle attached to the cloak, such as we see in contemporary German prints. But, in Venice (as in other Italian cities) the Jewish

badge had its own history and its own tradition. At the beginning it had indeed been in the universal form of a circle of yellow cloth the size of a small loaf, which had to be sewn on the breast of the outer garment. This, however, was not considered sufficiently prominent. Hence, at a later period, every Jew had to wear a yellow bonnet, or one covered with material of that colour. But ultimately, at the close of the sixteenth century, the statutory hue was changed to red—a convention which continued to prevail until the fall of the Serenissima. For the Levantine merchants, indeed, who were under a different control, the distinctive badge remained as before, and they could be distinguished by the yellow turbans which they wore. Shylock, however, was a *Tedesco* by nation, as we have seen. By Shakespeare's time the change of hue had already come about, as far as they were concerned. A traveller of the following century describes the "badge" as a hat covered with crimson cloth, lined and edged with black; while the poor used a waxed material instead. Shylock certainly did not belong to the poorer classes; and it is a headgear of the former description which he must have worn. It will be remembered how, according to Evelyn's account (certainly not *vero*, but admirably *ben trovato*), the same colour prevailed for the purpose in Rome, until one day a short-sighted cardinal mistook a red-hatted stranger for a fellow prince of the Church, and saluted him accordingly. . . .

As for the rest of the costume, it is not easy to be quite so precise. What, exactly, was the "Jewish gaberline" on which Messer Antonio spat? One cannot be over-definite on this point: unless Shakespeare had some vague idea of the *Tallith* or "praying-shawl," which is, however, worn only during prayer. The Levantine merchants are known to have continued to wear their flowing Oriental robes. The "Ponentines," for the most part polished refugees from Spain and Portugal, were probably dressed in full contemporary fashion, excepting for the fact that they were not permitted to bear swords. The rest of the population were a little less fashionable. Their clothing was not outlandish, however, nor did they wear any special garments. One may imagine them, probably, dressed for the most part in the style of the day before yesterday, but not, on the whole, in such a way as to attract special attention. Generally, though not (contrary to the ordinary impression) universally, they would be bearded. Shylock was notoriously so: indeed, it was on his beard that Antonio had "voided

his rheum," thereby arousing his rancour in the first instance.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the inhabitants of the Venetian Ghetto were not by any means unprepossessing: Thomas Coryat, only a few years after, was surprised at the number of "elegant and sweet-featured" persons whom he found there. As for Jessica, she may well have been dressed in the height of contemporary female elegance. Coryat spoke of the Ghetto belles, "some as beautiful as I ever I saw," who excelled English countesses for the splendour of their raiment and had serving-wenchs to hold up their trains. However, if she ever went outside the Ghetto, she would have had to cover her head with a kerchief of the same crimson hue as her father's hat.

"Go, Tubal, and meet me at our Synagogue." It is not difficult to say what synagogue is intended. Obviously, it is not the Spanish Synagogue, at present the show-place of the Venetian Ghetto, in which sentimental tourists think of Shylock and of Jessica. This, indeed, dates back in its present form to the period subsequent to Shakespeare's death, having been remodelled in 1635 by Longhena, architect of Santa Maria della Salute. In any case, Shylock, as a "German" Jew, would not have frequented it. He would have attended one of the "Ashkenazic" Synagogues, where the service was carried out according to his ancestral tradition. Of these, those two which were in existence in his day are still standing, though no longer regularly opened for service; the *Scuola Grande Tedesca*, founded in 1529, and the *Scuola Canton*, founded in 1532, side by side in a corner of the *Ghetto Nuovo*. It was in one of these that Shylock must have worshipped, and in which, if anywhere, his restless spirit must be sought to-day.

With this architectural detail, we may finish the picture of the historic Shylock. We are to imagine a bearded figure, soberly dressed save for his crimson hat, living in the *Ghetto Nuovo* at Venice. By ancestry, he was a German, though probably belonging to a family which had long been resident under the protection of the Lion of St. Marco. It is hardly to be doubted that he spoke excellent Italian, though possibly with a slightly guttural accent and with a few peculiar turns of phrase. Professionally he was a

<sup>1</sup> From the context, it appears to be fully within the bounds of possibility that it was Shylock's beard which Shakespeare had in mind as the "Jewish gaberdine."

"You . . . spit upon my Jewish gaberdine . . ."  
You, that did void your rheum upon my beard. . . ."

moneylender, his activities being regulated by the terms of the periodical *condotte* of his "nation," renewed every ten years. Incidentally, he sometimes came into possession of a variety of second-hand wares, as well as precious stones: though traffic in them was not his main activity. As, according to legend, Pope remarked, with reference to Macklin's production, in the most execrable couplet in English literature:

"This is the Jew  
That Shakespeare drew."



## A NOTE ON HENRY VI, PART II, AND THE CONTENTION OF YORK AND LANCASTER

By R. B. McKERROW

THE play of 2 *Henry VI* has come down to us in three forms :

(a) *The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, 4to, 1594 and 1600, the second edition being a reprint of the first with merely printing-house corrections and a few additional misprints.

(b) As the first part of *The Whole Contention betweene the two Famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke*,<sup>1</sup> 4to, [1619]. This is substantially a reprint of the quarto of 1594,<sup>2</sup> but departs from it in a number of readings, including one important passage setting forth the descent of Richard, Duke of York. In many of these variant readings the text of 1619 approximates much more closely to that of the folio than do the quartos of 1594 and 1600. It is evident that these alterations are not merely proof readers' corrections, but represent a fresh authority. A possible explanation is that the printer had obtained a quarto of 1594 which had been corrected soon after publication by some one familiar with the play through having seen it acted. The text would thus represent the same original play as the quarto of 1594, and not in any way a revision of this.

(c) As *The second Part of Henry the Sixth, with the death of the good Duke Humphrey*, in the First Folio of Shakespeare, 1623. This text, though agreeing with the *Contention* scene by scene in plot and in the arrangement of the action, differs from it in a very large number of readings, only some 50 per cent. of the lines being the same or substantially the same as in the quartos.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The inversion of the order of the names York and Lancaster may be due merely to the printer's desire to arrange his title in the usual coned form, which otherwise could not easily have been done with the types selected. In the heading of the text York stands first.

<sup>2</sup> As is shown by a comparison of the readings of the three editions as given in the "Cambridge" *Shakespeare* (W. Aldis Wright), vol. ix, or the reprint of the *Contention* in *The First Sketches of the Second and Third Parts of King Henry the Sixth*, ed. J. O. Halliwell (Shakespeare Soc.), 1843.

<sup>3</sup> The estimates vary greatly, cf. Malone's figures in the *Variorum* of 1821, xviii, 572, with Grant White's quoted in the Furnivall facsimile of the *Contention* 1594, p. xxi. These include *The True Tragedy* (3 *Hen. VI*) in the count.

Apart from questions of authorship, with which I do not propose to deal, the chief problem connected with 2 *Henry VI* is that of the relationship between the three forms mentioned above, and especially between the texts of the 1594 quarto and of the folio, the point at issue being whether the *Contention* gives us (a) an earlier or, at any rate, different draft of the play printed in 1623 as 2 *Henry VI*, or (b) a bad text of a play substantially identical with 2 *Henry VI*, in which latter case it presumably originated in an attempt to reconstruct the play from memory by some person, probably an actor, who was familiar with it on the stage.<sup>1</sup>

I have mentioned first of the alternative theories, the one which we may call the "revision" theory, as this seems to be the older, besides being the one in which most of us were brought up to believe. It was first put forward, with a detailed argument, by Malone,<sup>2</sup> and until quite recent times was accepted by the majority of Shakespearian scholars, including Dyce, the editors of the "Cambridge" edition, Miss Jane Lee, Furnivall, and H. C. Hart. The other view, that the *Contention* is simply a bad text, is also of quite respectable antiquity, for it was held by Johnson, who said in words which show how near he came to anticipating the conclusions of the present day:

The old copies of the two latter parts of Henry VI . . . are so apparently imperfect and mutilated, that there is no reason for supposing them the first draughts of *Shakspeare*. I am inclined to believe them copies taken by some auditor who wrote down, during the representation, what the time would permit, then perhaps filled up some of his omissions at a second or third hearing, and when he had by this method formed something like a play, sent it to the printer."<sup>3</sup>

Since Johnson's time it has been held by several scholars, including Thomas Kenny,<sup>4</sup> who thought that the copy for the quartos was surreptitiously obtained and made up partly from memory, partly from notes; and Mr. W. N. Lettsom, who calls the quartos "merely piratical depravations" of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, and holds

<sup>1</sup> We may dismiss the suggestion sometimes made that it is a bad transcript of 2 *Henry VI*. No copyist, however slovenly or ignorant, could make the kind of errors which are frequent here.

<sup>2</sup> Pope had long before referred to the *Contention* and *True Tragedy* as first sketches, but without any discussion.

<sup>3</sup> *Shakespeare*, ed. Johnson, 1765, v. 225; Boswell, *Variorum*, 1921, xviii, 549.

<sup>4</sup> See his *Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, 1864, pp. 277-367, especially pp. 362-64. I was directed to this book, which contains a full and very valuable discussion of Malone's views, by a footnote in Miss Jane Lee's article referred to below.

that "the first folio has given us . . . these . . . plays substantially as they were first written."<sup>1</sup> Apparently also to a certain extent this view was held by Fleay, who considered that the *Contention* was a "mangled and probably surreptitious copy of the original play, greatly abbreviated for acting." He held, however, that the original play was not identical with the folio version, though in many parts more like the folio than the quarto. His view is therefore a sort of compromise between the revision and bad text theories, partaking to some extent of both.

The most recent treatment of the question is that of Mr. Peter Alexander in his *Shakespeare's "Henry VI" and "Richard III,"* 1929, where he has argued with great ability and force that in the *Contention* we have merely a memorial reconstruction of 2 *Henry VI*, and that the quarto in no sense represents a separate version. He bases his argument mainly on the fact that the *Contention* contains confusions and errors which are easily explicable as the results of imperfect recollection of the text of 2 *Henry VI*, but could hardly exist in any play, however bad, as originally written. In particular he compares Richard, Duke of York's genealogical argument in the *Contention*, 1594, Sc. VI, with 2 *Henry VI*, II, ii, and shows that in the *Contention* the genealogy is so muddled that the point of it is quite obscured, whereas in 2 *Henry VI* all is clear.<sup>2</sup> The *Contention* cannot therefore be a good text of an original first draft which was later revised to form 2 *Henry VI*, but is a bad (reported) text of 2 *Henry VI* itself.<sup>3</sup>

With Mr. Alexander's conclusions as a whole, namely, that the *Contention* cannot be a good text of a first draft of *Henry VI*, I am entirely in agreement, but I cannot follow him in thinking that no revision took place between the original writing of the *Contention* and the printing of the play in the First Folio. Indeed, it seems to me that it is possible to show that, at least, the genealogical argument which Mr. Alexander cites as his principal piece of evidence for the relationship of the texts was revised or, at any rate, augmented by several lines, at some time subsequent to that at which the 1594

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Dyce in the preface to 1 *Henry VI* in his edition.

<sup>2</sup> For a comparison of the versions of this and other variant passages in the texts of 1594, 1600 and 1623, see *New Shaks. Trans.*, 1875-1876, pp. 285-89, or the Furnivall facsimile of the *Whole Contention*, pt. i.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Alexander holds similar views as to the relationship of the *True Tragedy* of Richard Duke of York and 3 *Henry VI*. The cases are almost exactly parallel and most of the arguments which apply to one pair would apply with equal force to the other.

text was constructed. This in itself is perhaps a point of secondary importance, for so long as a play continued to form part of a theatrical repertory there would be nothing surprising in minor alterations being made in the script from time to time. A recent survey of the whole question has, however, brought to light certain facts regarding the sources used in composing the play which, so far as I am aware, have not been noticed hitherto, and to which it seems worth while to call attention, on account of their possible bearing on the unity of composition of the original play.

First, however, something must be said on the general question of the identity, as a whole and apart from minor revisions, of the original of the *Contention* and 2 *Henry VI*. For the reason just given, the scene on which especial stress is laid by Mr. Alexander does not, in my opinion, afford such good evidence in support of this identity as he claims that it does; but even so there remains, I think, abundant evidence in support of it, of some of which he has made no use. Of particular significance in this connection are the numerous cases in which the text of 2 *Henry VI* contains unimportant reminiscences of the passages in Holinshed's *Chronicles* on which the play was based, though these reminiscences are absent from the *Contention*. When a playwright undertook the revision of a play it is quite possible that he might look up the historical or other source on which it was based if he wanted to make important structural changes, correct or make more intelligible a genealogy, or insert a new incident; but it is surely most unlikely that he would go through the text with the original (especially when he was dealing with a historical play the sources of which were to be found in disconnected paragraphs scattered through a large volume and needing much looking for) only for the purpose of inserting in his revision a number of verbal reminiscences of the source which had no bearing on the plot and in no way improved the dialogue. When, therefore, we find in 2 *Henry VI* a number of passages in which the text of that play is closer to the original in the *Chronicles* than the text of the *Contention* is,<sup>1</sup> we cannot suppose that this is due to a reviser of the

<sup>1</sup> Here are a few—there are several others: (1) The references to Reignier's large style and lean purse (i, i, 111-12) and to Suffolk's "whole fifteenth" (i, i, 133). (2) The phrase "York is meetest man" (i, iii, 163). (3) The inclusion of Southwell in the necromancy scene (i, iv). (4) The allusion at iv, iii, 12 to Jack Cade's dressing himself in Sir Humphrey Stafford's brigandine. (5) That to Cade's lodging at the White Hart in Southwark (iv, viii, 25). In all these cases 2 *Henry VI* contains details or reminiscences of phrasing from Holinshed which are not to be found in the *Contention*. It is much more natural to suppose that their relative

*Contention* collating the play with Holinshed and deliberately inserting these trifling and, in the circumstances, pointless reminiscences; but must assume that they were in the original version of the play and were left out in the *Contention*, which is therefore nothing but a bad text of the same original.

Boswell-Stone's *Shakespeare's Holinshed* is in most ways an admirable piece of work, but it suffers from one important defect. Its compiler had apparently convinced himself that the plays with which he had to deal were all based on the second (1587) edition of Holinshed (as, indeed, most of them were), and he therefore did not collate the earlier edition of 1577 with the extracts which he gives. In the present case this has resulted in his having to postulate the use of another chronicle, that of Halle or Grafton, in certain places. Thus he has had to refer to one of these other authorities for Sir John Stanley<sup>1</sup> (2 *Henry VI*, II, iii, 13, etc.), and for Alexander Iden<sup>2</sup> (2 *Henry VI*, IV, xi, 46), though these are actually the forms found in the 1577 edition.

It is impossible to discuss in detail here the sources of the whole play, but it can, I think, be shown that as regards the *Contention*, including the form of this given in the *Whole Contention*, there is no need to suppose the use of any other source than the 1577 edition of Holinshed<sup>3</sup> except for four passages.

- (1) The account of the pretended miracle of St. Albans (Sc. v).<sup>4</sup>
- (2) The naming of the youngest son of Edward III "William of Windsor" (Sc. VI, l. 18).<sup>5</sup>

unimportance led to their being accidentally omitted in writing down the *Contention* from memory than that they were deliberately sought out and inserted in turning the *Contention* into 2 *Henry VI*.

<sup>1</sup> The 1587 Holinshed has (correctly) "Thomas" for "John."

<sup>2</sup> Holinshed 1587 has "Eden" instead of "Iden." He is spelt "Eyden" in the *Contention*, but this is presumably the reporter's version of Iden.

<sup>3</sup> Holinshed's *Chronicles* copied largely from Grafton's *Chronicle* and Halle's *Union of the families of Lancastre and Yorke*, as Grafton's had copied from Halle. Many passages used for the play might therefore equally well have been taken from any one of the three. One minor point, however, in the *Whole Contention*, namely, the location of the birth of the son of the Black Prince at Angoulesme (see p. 164, below) seems to be peculiar to Holinshed, and the same is true of the phrase from which the "meetest man" of 2 *Henry VI*, I, iii, 163, appears to be derived.

<sup>4</sup> This might be from Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, to which Holinshed refers readers for further information about Humphrey of Gloucester, or from Grafton. Both give the story (originally More's) in full in almost identical words.

<sup>5</sup> Holinshed 1577 and 1587 have only "another William" in the passage from which the pedigree seems to be taken, and I have failed to discover the prince's full name anywhere in the 1577 edition. It is, however, given by Grafton (*Chronicle*, ed. 1809, i, 411) and others.

- (3) The reference to the wax taper carried by the Duchess of Gloucester during her penance (Sc. vii, l. 6).<sup>1</sup>
- (4) A speech of the dying Cardinal Beaufort in Sc. xi: "O death, if thou wilt let me live but one whole year, I'll give thee as much gold as will purchase such another Iland."<sup>2</sup>

None of these seems to tell against the use of Holinshed 1577 as the sole general source, with the possible exception of No. 4. No. 1 was probably a well-known story for which the dramatist would naturally refer to a specific source. No. 2 is the sort of scrap that remains in one's memory from casual reading, if not from school-days. In No. 3 the dramatist seems in any case to have amplified the accounts from the traditional forms of penance by adding the white sheet, and may therefore equally well have added the taper.

Let us now consider Sc. vi, ll. 1-42, of the *Contention* (ll. 1-52 in the *Whole Contention*) corresponding to 2 *Henry VI*, II, ii, 1-52, in which York sets out his claim to the throne.

If we compare this passage as given in *The First Part of the Contention*, 1594, with the corresponding lines of the *Whole Contention*, 1619, we shall see that they contain many phrases common to the two. On the other hand, each version contains something which is not in the other, the *Whole Contention* alone referring to the birth of the Black Prince's son Edward at *Angolesme*, while the 1594 text alone mentions the three daughters (there wrongly assigned to Lionel, Duke of Clarence), Alice, Anne and Elinor. This at first sight suggests that 1594 and 1619 in some way go back to different *revisions* of the play.

When, however, we refer to the historical source from which the passage was derived, we find that this contains, as well as all that is common to the two texts, all that is found in *either* of them, and it therefore becomes possible that both go back to the same

<sup>1</sup> This seems to be mentioned only in the 1587 Holinshed, and by Stowe (*Chronicles* [1580], p. 646), but were not the white sheet (not mentioned by the chroniclers) and taper traditional accompaniments of a public act of penance?

<sup>2</sup> It has been claimed that this is based on a passage in Haile, ed. 1809, p. 210: "Why should I dye hauing so muche ryches, if the whole Realme would saue my lyfe, I am able either by pollicie to get it, or by ryches to bye it. Fye, will not death be hyered, nor will money do nothyng?" The same occurs in Grafton and Foxe, but Holinshed has only a general reference to the Cardinal's wealth. At the same time it may be argued that the idea is an obvious one and there is not such close similarity in the phrasing of the two passages as to make the borrowing certain.



original dramatic form, which they have misrepresented in different ways.

The important part of the scene as it appears in the *Contention* must be given. I follow the text of 1619, as this appears more closely to represent the original, giving the principal variants of 1594.

Yorke. Then thus my Lords, [7]

Edward the third had seven sonnes,

The first was Edward the blacke Prince,

Prince of Wales. [10]

The second was William of Hatfield,

Who dyed young.

The third was Lyonell, Duke of Clarence.

The fourth was Iohn of Gaunt,

The Duke of Lancaster. [15]

The fift was Edmund of Langley,

Duke of Yorke.

The sixt was William of Windsore,

Who dyed young.

The seaventh and last was Sir Thomas of Woodstocke, Duke of [20]

Yorke.<sup>1</sup>

Now Edward the blacke Prince dyed before his Father, leauing behinde him two sonnes, Edward borne at Angolesme, who died young,<sup>2</sup> and Richard that was after crowned King, by the name of Richard the second, who dyed without an heyre.<sup>3</sup> [25]

Lyonell Duke of Clarence dyed, and left him one only daughter, named Phillip, who was married to Edmund Mortimer earle of March and Vlster: and so by her I claime the Crowne, as the true heire to Lyonell Duke of Clarence, third sonne to Edward the third. Now sir, in time of Richards reigne, Henry of Bullingbrooke, sonne and heire to Iohn of Gaunt, the Duke of Lancaster fourth sonne to Edward the third, he claim'd the Crowne, deposd the Merthfull King, and as both you know, in Pomfret Castle harmelesse Richard was shamefully murthered, and so by Richards death came the house of Lancaster vnto the Crowne. [35]

Sal. Sauing your tale my Lord, as I haue heard in the reigne of Bullenbrooke, the Duke of Yorke did claime the Crowne, and but for Owen Glendour had bene King.

Yorke. True: but so it fortun'd then, by meanes of that mon-

<sup>1</sup> 1594 gives "Edmund of Langly" as the second son; "Roger Mortemor, Earle of March," as the fifth; "sir Thomas of Woodstocke" as the sixth, and "William of Winsore" as the seventh. It omits the two phrases "Who dyed young." The second "Duke of Yorke" (ll. 20-1), an evident error, is not in 1594.

<sup>2</sup> 1594 does not mention the son Edward.

<sup>3</sup> 1594 here continues "Edmund of Langly Duke of Yorke died, and left behind him two daughters, Anne and Elinor. Lyonell Duke of Clarence died, and left behinde Alice, Anne and Elinor, that was after married to my father, and by her I claime the Crowne" [etc. as 1619].

strous rebell Glendour, the noble Duke of Yorke was putte<sup>1</sup> to [40] death, and so euer since the heires of Iohn of Gaunt haue possessed the Crowne. But if the issue of the elder should succeed before the issue of the younger, then am I lawfull heire vnto the Kingdome.

The following are the passages from the 1577 Holinshed on which the above lines of the *Contention* appear to me to have been founded. These passages are practically identical in the two editions of Holinshed, but as we have seen that the author of the play used that of 1577 for the names of Sir John Stanley and Alexander Iden, it seems natural to suppose him to have used it throughout.

Ll. 8-21. These appear to come from a passage in Holinshed's account of Edward III :

He [Edward III] had issue by his wife Queene Philip, seuen sonnes, Edward Prince of Wales, William of Hatfelde that dyed yong, Lionell Duke of Clarence, Iohn of Gaunt Duke of Lancaster, Edmonde of Langley Earle of Cambridge, and after created Duke of Yorke, Thomas of Woodstocke Erle of Buckingham after made duke of Gloucester, and an other William which dyed likewise yong. [Holinshed, *Chronicles*, 1577, iii, sig. 204<sup>rb</sup>; ed. 1807-1808, ii, 706.]

Note here the repetition of the words "died young." It would be a very unusual chance which would cause precisely the same words to be similarly repeated, if this is not the source of the passage in the *Whole Contention*. There are, however, two departures from the original. In the *Whole Contention* the order of the last two sons is reversed; as I believe, simply by fault of memory. They are correctly arranged in *The First Part*. Further, in both early texts the younger William is called *William of Windsor*. As already stated, I cannot find the full title anywhere in Holinshed 1577.

Ll. 22-25. From three earlier passages of the same reign :

In the .39. yere of K. Edwards raigne, and in the moneth of Februarie, in the Citie of Angolesme, was borne the firste sonne of Prince Edward, and was named after his father, but he departed this life in the seuenth yere of his age.<sup>2</sup> [Hol. 1577, sig. 2N2<sup>ra</sup>; ed. 1807-1808, ii, 680.]

This yere at Burdeaux, was borne the second sonne of Prince Edward named Richard. [Hol. 1577, sig. 2N2<sup>rb</sup>; 1807-1808, ii, 681.]

Also king Edward after the deceasse of hys sonne prince Edward, created the Lord Richard, sonne to the sayd Prince, as heyre to him, Prince of Wales. [Hol. 1577, sig. 2O3<sup>rb</sup>; ed. 1807-1808, ii, 704.]

<sup>1</sup> 1594 "done."

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.* in 1371, before his father's death in 1376. The *Whole Contention* is therefore wrong in saying that the Black Prince left two sons.

The phrase in l. 25, "who dyed without an heyre" may be taken as common knowledge.

Ll. 26-30. From Holinshed's account of Richard II, but much confused :

Also by auctoritie of this parliament [1385], Roger lorde Mortimer earle of March, sonne and heire of Edmund Mortimer Earle of Marche and of the Lady Philippe eldest daughter and heire vnto Lionell Duke of Clarence, thirde sonne to king Edward the third, was established heire aparant to the crown of this realme and shortlye after so proclaimed. The whiche erle of Marche anone after the end of the same parliament, sailed into Ireland to his lordship of Vlster, wherof he was owner by right of his saide mother. . . . This Roger erle of Marche had issue Edmunde and Roger, Anne, Ales and Eleanore, which Eleanor was made a Nunne. The ij sonnes died without issue, and Anne the eldest of the daughters was married to Richarde erle of Cambridge, son vnto Edmunde of Langlie before remembred : The which Richard had issue by the saide Anne, a sonne called Richard, that was after Duke of Yorke, and father to king Edward the fourth. [Hol. 1577, 2R5<sup>vb</sup>; ed. 1807-8, ii. 768].

It will be noted that this passage may explain the naming of *Edmund Mortimer* <sup>1</sup> "earle of March and Vlster," a title which, so far as I have observed, is nowhere actually given to him in the English section of the *Chronicles*, though it occurs in the "Historie of Ireland" [Hol. 1577, "Ireland," sig. D8<sup>vb</sup>; ed., 1807-1808, vi, 258]. Further, the reference in the *First Part of the Contention* to "Alice,<sup>2</sup> Anne and Elinor," where these are stated (wrongly) to be the daughters of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, seems also to be derived ultimately from this passage and to indicate that originally a larger portion of the Holinshed passage was reproduced, as indeed is necessary in order to give the genealogy in an intelligible form. It must, I think, have read somewhat to the following effect.

Edmund Mortimer earle of March and Vlster [of whom she had a son Roger. This Roger had issue Edmund, Roger, Anne, Ales and Eleanor. Edmund and Roger died without issue, and Anne the eldest daughter, my mother, was married to Richard earl of Cambridge] and so by her I claime the crowne, as the true heire of Lyonell Duke of Clarence.

It is possible, though not, I think, certain, that a passage in "the

<sup>1</sup> This Edmund Mortimer was never Earl of Ulster, though his son Roger was, the title passing to Roger from Lionel by way of his mother Philippa.

<sup>2</sup> It is important to observe that Alice is not mentioned in the passage from the "Articles betwixt King Henrie and the duke of Yorke," from which the corresponding lines of 2 *Henry VI* are derived; see pp. 167-8, below.

duke of York's oration to the Parliament" in 1460 was also used here.

After whose [Richard II's] piteous death, & execrable murther, the right and title of the Crowne, and superioritie of this Realme was lawfully reuerted and returned to Roger Mortimer Earle of Marche, sonne and heyre to Ladie Philippe the onely childe of the aboue rehearsed Lionell Duke of Clarence, to whiche Rogers daughter called Anne, my most dearest and welbeloued mother, I am the verie true and lineall heyre. [Hol. 1577; iii, sig. 3K3<sup>a</sup>, b; ed. 1807-1808, iii, 263.]

Ll. 30-35. This seems to be based more or less on common knowledge, but it may have been derived in part from a passage immediately preceding that last quoted.

Whiche king Richarde of that name the second, was lawfully & iustly possessed of the Crown and Diademe of this realme and region, till Henric of Darbie Duke of Lancaster and Hereforde, sonne to Iohn of Gaunt Duke of Lancaster, the fourth begotten sonne to the sayde king Edward the third, & yonger brother to my noble auncester Lionell duke of Clarence, the third begotten sonne of the sayd king Edward . . . raysed warre . . . agaynst the sayde king Richarde, and him apprehended, and imprisoned within the tower of London. [Hol. 1577, sig. 3K3<sup>a</sup>; ed. 1807-1808, iii, 263.]

L. 33. The death of Richard II in Pomfret Castle is narrated by Holinshed [1577, sig. 2Y5<sup>a</sup>, 1807-1808, iii, 14].

Ll. 36-38. Apparently also from the Duke of York's Oration to the Parliament:

Edmonde Earle of Marche my moste welbeloued Vncle in the tyme of the firste Vsurper in deede, but not by right called King Henrie the fourth, by hys cousins the Earle of Northumberlande, and the Lord Percie, he beeing then in captiuitie wyth Owen Glendor, the Rebell in Wales, made hys tytyle & righteous clayme to the destruction of both the noble persons. Likewise my most deerest Lorde and father<sup>1</sup> so farre set forth that right and tytyle, that hee lost his life and worldly ioy at the towne of Southhampton, more by power than indifferent Iustice. [Hol. 1577, 3K3<sup>tb</sup>; ed. 1807-1808, iii, 263.]

We thus see that all the historical details in the claim of Richard, Duke of York to the throne as set forth in the *Contention* may have been derived from the 1577 edition of Holinshed, and as we have seen that certain other details in the *Contention* can only have been derived from that edition,<sup>2</sup> or at least cannot have been taken from

<sup>1</sup> I.e. Richard, Earl of Cambridge, second son of Edmund of Langley, executed at Southampton in 1415.

<sup>2</sup> I.e. the names Sir John Stanley and Iden, see p. 161, above.

the edition of 1587, it seems reasonable to regard the 1577 edition as the source of this claim also.

When, however, we turn to 2 *Henry VI*, II, ii, we find that this passage has a very different aspect. While part of it, namely, ll. 10-32 and 39-43, may well be merely a paraphrase of the original *Contention* play, as is indicated by the presence of certain phrases which had appeared in the quarto texts, there are two insertions, ll. 33-38 and 43-50, which though necessarily repeating certain facts given in the *Contention* seem clearly to have another source. These run in the First Folio as follows :

*Salisb.* But *William* of Hatfield dyed without an Heire.  
*Yorke.* The third Sonne, Duke of Clarence,  
 From whose Line I clayme the Crowne,  
 Had Issue *Phillip*, a Daughter,  
 Who marryed *Edmond Mortimer*, Earle of March :  
*Edmond* had Issue, *Roger*, Earle of March ;  
*Roger* had Issue, *Edmond*, *Anne*, and *Elianor*

*Yorke.* His eldest Sister, *Anne*,  
 My Mother, being Heire vnto the Crowne,  
 Marryed *Richard*, Earle of Cambridge,  
 Who was to *Edmond Langley*,  
*Edward* the thirds fift Sonnes Sonne ;  
 By her I clayme the Kingdome :  
 She was Heire to *Roger*, Earle of March,  
 Who was the Sonne of *Edmond Mortimer*,  
 Who marryed *Phillip*, sole Daughter  
 Vnto *Lionel*, Duke of Clarence.  
 [So, if the Issue of the elder Sonne  
 Succeed before the younger, I am King.]

It was long ago noticed that these lines are a paraphrase of the very clear and precise statement of claim which is included in the "Articles betwixt king Henrie and the duke of Yorke," printed first by Stow (*Chronicles* [1580], 700-02),<sup>1</sup> and later in the 1587 Holinshed. Compare with the above the following passages :

Lionell the third sonne of Edward the third, duke of Clarence, had issue Philip his daughter and heire which was coupled in matrimonie vnto Edmond Mortimer earl of March, and had issue Roger Mortimer earle of March his sonne and heire ; which Roger had issue of [*sic*] Edmund

<sup>1</sup> It may be remarked that though occasionally Stow gives more detail than Holinshed, his *Chronicles* are in general far too summary to have served as a source of the play. He agrees with the 1587 Holinshed in giving Sir Thomas Stanley and Alexander Eden (not Iden).

erle of March, Roger Mortimer, Ann, Elianor; which Edmund, Roger and Elianor died without issue.

And the said Anne coupled in matrimonie to Richard earl of Cambridge, the sonne of Edmund of Langlie, the fifth sone of Henrie [*sic for* Edward], and had issue Richard Plantaganet, commonlie called duke of Yorke: Iohn of Gant, the fourth sonne of Edward, and the younger brother of the said Lionell, had issue Henrie earle of Derbie. . . . To the which Richard duke of Yorke, as sonne to Anne daughter to Roger Mortimer earle of Marche, sonne and heire of the said Philip, daughter and heire of the said Lionell, the third sonne of king Edward the third, the right, title, dignitie royall, and estate of the crownes of the realmes of England and France, and the lordship of Ireland pertaineth and belongeth afore anie issue of the said Iohn of Gant, the fourth sonne of the same king Edward. [Holinshed, *Chronicles*, 1587, iii, 3Q3<sup>rb</sup>-3Q3<sup>va</sup>; ed. 1807-1808, iii, 265-66.]

Thus, while the source of the original *Contention* as a whole appears to be the Holinshed of 1577, those passages in this scene of 2 *Henry VI*, which differ from the corresponding passages of the *Contention*, and seem to show revision, are based on an addition to Holinshed which is only found in the edition of 1587. It seems to me, therefore, that we can hardly doubt that in these passages the play was actually and deliberately revised. It is perhaps further arguable that the revision was either by another author or at a date some time later than the original writing.

I therefore suggest that the history of the play may have been somewhat on the following lines:

1. A *Contention* play was written, based on the Holinshed of 1577.

2. A (probably) pirated text of this as performed,<sup>1</sup> taken down from the memory of certain actors, apparently with the help of a few fragments of copy,<sup>2</sup> was printed in 1594 and again in 1600.

3. It was obvious that the genealogy of Sc. VI in these editions was hopelessly wrong. When, therefore, it was desired to reprint the play in 1619, a copy of the quarto of 1594 was used in which certain improvements, also from memory of the play as performed, had been incorporated. This edition, in spite of the differences in reading, is thus also derived from the original form of the play. By putting together the 1594 and 1619 texts, together with the

<sup>1</sup> Probably with certain cuts, e.g. I, i, 214-35; or the omission of this may possibly be a slip on the part of the reporter.

<sup>2</sup> This is rather puzzling, but see Alexander, pp. 82 ff. Chambers, *Shakespeare*, 283, suggests that the reporter was a book-keeper who had a "plot" and the citizen's part.



passages of Holinshed apparently used as sources, we can arrive at some probable approximation to this portion of Sc. VI as originally written.

4. At some time subsequent to the original performances of the play, it had, however, been perceived that even at its best the genealogy of Sc. VI was not very clear, and that the matter was presented in a much better form in the "Articles betwixt king Henrie and the duke of Yorke" in the later edition of Holinshed.<sup>1</sup> The passage was therefore worked over in the theatre copy of the play and a few new lines added. This gave 2 *Henry VI* as we have it in the Folio.<sup>2</sup>

If this view is correct, certain subsidiary questions seem to arise. Can we argue that the use of the 1577 Holinshed as the source of the *Contention* implies that the play was written before the appearance of the edition of 1587? We might, I think, fairly say that if both editions were equally available to, and known by, the playwright, he would almost certainly have based his genealogical references throughout on the "Articles" in the later one, where the material is given in a very convenient form, instead of collecting the data from scattered passages as he seems to have done. But of course the 1587 edition may not have been accessible to him, even though it existed. On the other hand, we may remember that in all the Histories with the exception of *Henry VI*<sup>3</sup> there seems to be evidence that Shakespeare made use of the 1587 Holinshed and *not* of the earlier one. If the *Contention* was originally written before 1587 it can hardly have been Shakespeare's. Can we argue that, if it was written *after* 1587, the use of the earlier Holinshed renders it unlikely that it was his? These questions are perhaps worth consideration; but I prefer to leave the answers, if any are possible, to others.

<sup>1</sup> It is of course possible that the "Articles" were read in Stow's *Chronicles* [1580], but this seems on the whole less likely in view of the general use of Holinshed by the dramatists as a source-book.

<sup>2</sup> It seems to me impossible to determine whether any of the other variations between the quarto and folio texts are deliberate alterations in the latter; though it is, I think, quite clear that at any rate a large number of them are due merely to misreporting in the former.

<sup>3</sup> And *King John*, the history of which was taken almost entirely from the *Troublesome Reign*.

## SOME NOTES ON ROBERT GOMERSALL

By ELISABETH SCHNEIDER

A FEW new facts have recently come to light regarding the life of Robert Gomersall, the little-known seventeenth-century poet and dramatist (author of but one play, the *Tragedie of Ludovick Sforza*), and friend of Thomas Fuller and Richard Corbet. The biographical material hitherto published has been confined for the most part to records of his admission to Christ Church, Oxford,<sup>1</sup> to the dates of his degrees and taking of orders, and to two places mentioned by himself in his verses. The first of these is Flower, in Northamptonshire, where he is known to have been in 1625; but whether he was living there as curate, as the *Dictionary of National Biography* suggests, or whether he was merely upon a visit to escape the plague which was then raging at Oxford, as Gilchrist, Corbet's biographer, states,<sup>2</sup> cannot now be positively determined.

The second place with which his name has been associated is Thorncombe, formerly in Devon but now in Dorset, a parish of which, by his own statement, he was vicar in 1640.<sup>3</sup> According to the episcopal records of the Diocese of Exeter, only recently investigated, he was instituted to this vicarage in May 1628. It appears, therefore, that nearly all his life after leaving Oxford was spent in this parish, a remote one, but within short walking distance of Broadwindsor, where Thomas Fuller was living.

<sup>1</sup> He entered Christ Church, according to the matriculation records, in 1616, at the age of fourteen. He was said to be the "son of an Esquire," and to have been born in London. An attempt was made by Joseph Hunter, in his *Chorus Vatum Anglicanorum*, to identify his father with Gomersall, "the mercer by Temple Bar," whose bankrupt sale is described in the John Chamberlain letters. However, an inspection of the will of this mercer, Richard Gomersall, and of that of his wife, reveals no son Robert, though other children are named. Numerous Gomersalls appear in London records of the period, and the poet might have been the son of almost any of them.

<sup>2</sup> *The Poems of Richard Corbet* (4th ed., London, 1807, containing a "life of the author" by Octavius Gilchrist: lxxx and 260). Gilchrist's statement receives some support from a religious argument irrelevantly introduced into one of Gomersall's sermons, defending the practice of fleeing from a plague-stricken area.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Fuller, *Holy Warre*, 2nd ed., 1640, with commendatory verses by Gomersall.

The date of Gomersall's death has never been conclusively established. His will was proved October 31, 1646,<sup>1</sup> and it has therefore been generally assumed that he died in that year.<sup>2</sup> It now seems clear, however, that his death occurred some two and a half years earlier. Unfortunately, the parish register is of no use on this point, its records for the years 1644 to 1648 being incomplete. But the diocesan records state that Gomersall's successor was instituted to the vicarage in June 1644, "on the death of Robert Gomersall." Possibly this should not be regarded as conclusive evidence that the poet died in 1644. In view of the troubled state of the times it is barely possible that the vicar had only fled;<sup>3</sup> it is also possible that he died even earlier, since livings were not always filled promptly at this time. But it is far more likely that the record is correct, and that his widow delayed the proving of his will until 1646, perhaps deliberately, fearing the very action which a Parliamentary Committee actually took against her several years later.

It is also possible now to identify Gomersall's wife. In his will, after disposing of a respectable fortune (£1,000 to his son Robert, £500 each to his daughters Helen and Christian, and "all his other estate" to his wife Helen), he says: "Item I desire my Brother Richard Bragge John Bragg William Larder esq. and Roger Knight

<sup>1</sup> Anthony à Wood (*Athenæ Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, ii, 590) states that "one Rob. Gomersall, who seems to be a Devonian born, died 1646, leaving then by his will £1000 to his son Robert." Wood, and others after him, take from this the probable date of the poet's death as 1646. Yet Wood expresses the opinion that the will is that of the poet's father, not of the poet himself, probably because "Devonian born" did not agree with the Oxford Matriculation record which says "born in London." But Wood is clearly wrong. The poet cannot have been the son who inherited £1000, for this son when the will was drawn in 1643 was said to be not yet of age, whereas the poet's age at the time must have been forty-one. Other circumstances show that it must be the poet's will: in the Probate Act Book its author is described as "[ ]ate of Thorncombe in Devon," and the dates of the diocesan record show the same Robert Gomersall to have been vicar in 1643, when the will was made, as in 1640, when the poet signed himself vicar of Thorncombe in his verses to Fuller.

<sup>2</sup> A still later date, 1652, is given in J. Hutchins's *History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset* (3rd ed., 1861-73, iv. 531). This error arose from misinterpretation of the Thorncombe register, which records the death of a Robert Gomersall, undoubtedly the poet's son Robert, in 1652.

<sup>3</sup> A reference to this phase of Gomersall's life, though inaccurate, is undoubtedly intended in Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*. He does not mention the name of the vicar, and he refers to the parish as "Thornton." But there was no parish by that name in Devon, and the other details suggest Thorncombe. He says it is reported that the vicar was forced to fly; "if so," he adds, "it must have been soon after the Breaking out of the Rebellion; for in 1644 J. Bragg was admitted to it; and kept it during the whole Course of the Usurpation." A John Bragge was, we know, Gomersall's successor at Thorncombe.

gentleman to be the overseers of this my Will. . . ." This, in conjunction with the residence stated in a report of the Committee for Advance of Money in 1649, of Gomersall's widow at "Sadborow, co. Devon," indicates that the poet had married a member of the Bragge family, who had come into possession of the manor of Sadborow at Thorncombe during the reign of Elizabeth. Neither the register of Thorncombe nor the published list of marriage licences of the Diocese of Exeter for the period record any Gomersall marriage. But the present representative of the Bragge family lent the writer a genealogy in MS. (drawn up within the last generation), according to which a Helen Bragge was born December 27, 1608,<sup>1</sup> the daughter of Richard Bragge, Esquire, of Sadborow House. She was a sister of Captain Richard Bragge ("my Brother Richard" of Gomersall's will), known to local historians as leader of a "troupe of horse" which performed dashing exploits in the King's cause, and whose property was sequestered by the Parliament. The genealogy records that she was married first to Alexander Every of Abbot's Wootton, gentleman, on February 26, 162<sup>5</sup>/<sub>R</sub>,<sup>2</sup> and secondly to the Rev. Robert Gomersall, vicar of Thorncombe. "Alexander Every, gentleman," moreover, was the patron by whose recommendation Gomersall was installed as vicar on May 13, 1628. Events must have moved swiftly after Gomersall's arrival in Thorncombe; it appears that within less than two years Every had died, and his widow had married the young vicar and had a child, for the baptism of Gomersall's first child, Helen, was recorded March 23, 16<sup>29</sup>/<sub>30</sub>. It is possible, however, that Helen Bragge's first husband was not the same Alexander Every as Gomersall's patron.

Of more importance than this is some evidence which relates Gomersall to the public controversies of the period, and which gives thus some notion of the circumstances under which his work was produced, as well as some possible explanation of the fact that he published nothing during the last ten years of his life. The evidence amounts to this: that he was a Royalist, active in the King's cause; that some, if not all, of his property was sequestered; and that his widow was later imprisoned by order of Parliament for refusing to

<sup>1</sup> This is corroborated by an entry in the birth register.

<sup>2</sup> The printed register contains the entry "Alexander Every and Mablen Bragg 26 Feb. 1626." I have not had an opportunity to check this with the original, but *Mablen* would seem to be a possible misreading of *Helen* or *Hellen*.

comply with a sequestration order brought about by her husband's political activity.

As early as 1634 we find him preaching sermons,<sup>1</sup> presumably at Thorncombe, in defence of royal and established authority, and in opposition to the Puritan element which, to judge from the tone of these sermons, was very strong in the parish. He evidently felt himself very much on the defensive even at this date. The rest of the surviving evidence dates from a period about five years after Gomersall's death.<sup>2</sup> In 1649 the parliamentary Committee for Advance of Money was asked to reimburse one Daniel Searle, a London merchant and later Governor of Barbadoes, for ships and money which he had lost in the cause of the Parliament. The Committee decided to repay him partly out of money from Robert Gomersall's estate. But the case grew exceedingly complicated: claims of one sort or another were made and then withdrawn by sundry persons. On the information of a certain Joseph Johnson, Gomersall had been "proved a delinquent"—proved, that is, an active supporter of the King's cause. Yet others also considered themselves to be the "discoverers" of his Royalist activities and claimed therefore a share of his sequestered property. The Committee, utterly bewildered, called upon the Camden House Committee to report what it knew of the case. On November 29, 1649, this latter committee reported: "We sequestered Gomersall for assisting the enemy, and recovered a debt of £200 in the hands of Martin Cozens, who being sued for it by the executors of Gomersall, we ordered that he should not be molested; this order was disobeyed, so Cozens applied to the Commissioners for Indemnity, who confirmed the order. We also seized a debt of £1,500 in the hands of Robert Henley, but found it not payable till 1650, so we admonished him not to pay it without order."

It was from this £1,500 which Henley owed the estate of Gomersall that the Committee for Advance of Money decided to reimburse Searle. But in December Mrs. Gomersall produced "writings" to show that this £1,500 debt was part of £100 a year which she was to receive from her husband's estate. The Committee ruled that the debt was forfeited for Gomersall's delinquency,

<sup>1</sup> *Sermons on St. Peter*, London, 1634; a somewhat rare volume.

<sup>2</sup> The account of the original proceedings against him appears to have been lost. The Public Record Office preserves an almost contemporary MS. index of Royalist Composition Papers, in which the name of Robert Gomersall occurs. This index, however, has never been identified with any existing records.

but that £100 a year should be given to the widow, "Ellen," as she is called throughout the proceedings. She must sign a release for the debt and the Committee would pay her £500.<sup>1</sup>

The rest of the proceedings, still bristling with minor complications, resolves itself into the efforts of the Committee to enforce this ruling. On the one hand they try to collect the debt from Henley, and on the other to compel Mrs. Gomersall to relinquish her claim upon it.<sup>2</sup> By the middle of April 1650, they have sold up Henley's estate by force, and thus collected most of the debt. But Mrs. Gomersall is still recalcitrant, and is threatened with being "committed for contempt." On October 1, 1651, she is "brought up in custody," but refuses to sign a release of the debt, this time claiming that it was "in trust for her jointure." She is imprisoned, and in November pleads to be set free. On December 3 she begs "release on bail, to prosecute her business," for she is "sick and weak, and cannot go forth to recover her health, or advise with her counsel"; and she affirms, moreover, that no "delinquency or malignancy" has been proved against her. Two weeks later she again complains of being kept "under lamentable restraint, and threatened that none shall come near her." At last, on December 19, she gives in, and is set at liberty after having signed the release and pocketed her remaining £500.<sup>3</sup>

A contributor to *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*<sup>4</sup> records an echo of the same affair. He states that Robert Gomersall, vicar of Thorncombe, "is said to have preached invective sermons against the Parliament, to have generally left home when the Parliament forces prevailed and to have returned when the King's party obtained some advantage. His wife Ellen was arrested by order of the Parliament when riding to London."

One other note may also be set down. Hutchins, in his history of Dorset,<sup>5</sup> mentions a document preserved at Forde Abbey, near

<sup>1</sup> This furnishes yet further evidence that Gomersall died in 1644 and not in 1646, for this £500 clearly represents the £100 a year due to his widow from the time of his death to the year 1649.

<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile, these two were carrying on their own dispute about the payment of both principal and interest in the Court of Chancery (Case of Gomersall v. Henley, Bundle G63, No. 131, and G64, No. 88, *Chancery Proceedings, temp. Charles I.*).

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Advance of Money, 1642-1656*, in the series of *State Papers Domestic*, ii, 714-16, 1127-29.

<sup>4</sup> "Sidelights on the Civil War in Dorset," by F. J. Pope (*Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*, xii (1910-1911), 54 ff.). My extract is from a number of items about Dorset people, which Pope says were taken from proceedings in Chancery.

<sup>5</sup> Hutchins, *op. cit.*, 531.



Thorncombe, respecting Robert Gomersall, the vicar. The library and all the documents at Forde Abbey, however, were dispersed between 1845 and 1865, and this record is not now to be found.

The substance of all these details, though little enough, enables us to add at least the following facts to what has previously been known of Gomersall: first, that he had married Helen (or Ellen) Bragge of Sadborow, and had a child by the year 1629; second, that he was living in Thorncombe by 1628, and thus spent there most of his life after leaving Oxford—a fact which, it may be observed, leaves a comparatively short time for Gomersall to become, as Wood says he did, “a very florid preacher in the University”;<sup>1</sup> finally, that he was a Royalist and suffered in the King’s cause. As for the date of his death, it must almost certainly be placed before June 24, 1644, although it is barely possible to suppose that, forced out of his living at this time, he lived on, perhaps in hiding, until 1646.

<sup>1</sup> He did not receive the degree of B.D. until the year of his installation at Thorncombe, though he had received his M.A. in 1621.

## SOME UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF THOMAS DE QUINCEY

THE following letters shed a light almost as humorous as pathetic on those "shiftings and burrowings"—as David Masson calls them—which marked De Quincey's early residence in Edinburgh: repeated migrations, motivated less by love of change than lack of funds. For although by this time established in the current world of letters, the dreamer never had the knack of ready money; too impractical to attract and too improvident to retain it. They date from the year of the death of his well-loved youngest son, and illustrate only too well his credulity, weakness, and inveterate but unavailing good intent.

Under the modest anonymity of B.B., Lady Nairne was then in her heyday as a lyrist; but De Quincey, no more than any other of her readers, had cause to associate her name with *Caller Herrin'*, or *The Land of the Leal*. To him she was only one more of those stony-hearted folk who refuse, where financial transactions are concerned, to accept the will as equal to the deed.

Did her ladyship relent? Or was "the rent made worse"? We do not know. The story breaks off in the midst, at its harrowing crisis.

A word as to the provenance of the documents. They formed part of the extensive collection of William Watson, bookseller-connoisseur of Prince's Street, Edinburgh, whose many artistic and literary treasures passed to the National Gallery of that City. William Watson, who died in 1881, had early characteristic contact with their writer, for in after years he frequently related how "Mr. De Quincey's young, fair-haired English laddies" would be sent to borrow money. An experience with, alas, no claim to be unique!

The originals are now in possession of his niece, Miss McKay of Oxtou, Birkenhead, by whose permission they are now published.

E. HAMILTON MOORE.

### I

Thursday night, August 23.

GENTLEMEN,

I wish to request a little extension of time, viz. 24 days, for the £27 bill; my reason for which is—that my own remittance from England, on which I depend for the payment of this bill, has been

from peculiar circumstances delayed to the 5<sup>th</sup> of September: and I presume that this short delay will not strike you as any unreasonable set-off against my payment in advance of £10—which I take for granted you received through the hands of M<sup>r</sup> Duguid upwards of a month ago. Trifling as that sum may seem, yet—and I see no reason to be ashamed of saying it—even such a deduction from my funds, at a time when I had made no preparation to meet it, caused me an embarrassment to which I was reconciled only by the earnest desire I had to mark my sincere intention of punctual payment; an intention about which I was greatly shocked to hear that any doubt could have been felt. Surely in common candor any delay of payment, which had been made by me *avowedly and openly and under a legal sanction*, ought not to be construed as an indication of a general intention to delay payment in other cases where no such avowal had been made and no such sanction obtained.

The truth <is><sup>1</sup> is, my embarrassments began [as M<sup>r</sup> Duguid, I believe, stated to you] in *cautionary* obligations: but they were completed by other and larger obligations of honor and kindness, which M<sup>r</sup> Duguid seems not clearly to have understood. One payment of nearly £200, made on this account to Mess<sup>rs</sup> Duckworth and Denison \* of Manchester, put the seal to my difficulties. To obtain money for this and other payments, I was obliged to renounce for a long period a large part of <my> the income which I draw as a voluntary allowance from a relation of my mothers: nor will it revert to me in full until next <January> Christmas. Within 8 months from that event, I do not doubt that I shall have paid every creditor I have with interest at 5 per cent. <Meni> Meaning thus (as most firmly I did and do) to pay off to the last farthing those old debts against which I have a legal protection, it cannot be supposed that I contemplated any delay of payment <with regard> with regard to those new ones against which I have no such protection. *A fortiori* then not with regard to a house which I hope to obtain for another year by the satisfactoriness of my payments.

Finally, that I may not seem to urge the time of my remittances only when it happens to favor myself, I will mention that between the 5<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> of October I receive another remittance—from which I will pledge my word to send you £20 immediately as another off-set to the short delay I am now applying for. The small balance, which

<sup>1</sup> Words and passages deleted are represented with pointed brackets, additions in heavy type, editorial comments in italics within square brackets.

will then remain of the first half-year's rent, I will make good in a week or two after.

I remain, Gentlemen,

Your obedient humble servant,

THOMAS DE QUINCEY.

\* They are eminent Solicitors ; and I mention their names, because (though not acquainted with all the particulars of the case) they will be able to vouch for the general fact that £180 was paid to them last year on my account, and in discharge of arrears on a mortgage *not mine*.

## II

Monday morning August 26.

GENTLEMEN,

I received yesterday morning by a special messenger so strange a letter from M<sup>r</sup> Duguid [dated Aug<sup>r</sup> 24], mystifying one of the simplest transactions I was ever a party to, and calling upon me to draw up a letter totally inconsistent with the truth but shaped to meet his statement to yourselves, and meant therefore for no purpose that I can understand but that of screening himself at any expence to my character and interests,—that I resolved at once, unless M<sup>r</sup> Duguid should, by his answer to a letter of expostulation sent over to him last night by me, clear himself from the painful suspicions which arose, no longer to send any communication to yourselves through his hands—but to do myself justice by a clear account of the whole <matter> affair from first to last addressed <sent> directly to yourselves. In my letter of last night I desired M<sup>r</sup> Duguid to say plainly what had become of the money entrusted to him for paying over to you<selves>: that question admitted of no evasion ; and accordingly, as I painfully anticipated, no answer of any kind was returned. It is now 2 o'clock P.M. on Monday ; and (no answer having still arrived) I feel myself warranted in writing to you without further delay.

On Wednesday July 17, being in Edinburgh, I spent the night at a coffee-house : some law business had furnished M<sup>r</sup> Duguid with a reason for requiring my presence ; but the main [or, as I have *now* cause for thinking, the sole] purpose was—to obtain the money and the complementary bill for the quarter's rent ; a payment which M<sup>r</sup> Duguid had for sometime before been urging upon me as a *sine-qua-non* towards placing myself on a right footing in law. The point in debate was the amount to be offered in cash. M<sup>r</sup> Duguid

assured me that he had actually promised you the entire £27. But, when I refused with some warmth to be bound by offers which I had never authorized, he lowered his demand to £15. Upon this I drew out my purse, and said that all which it contained, reserving only what was indispensable for a few household bills then owing and also for the coffee-house bill, should be held disposable for the rent,—but that the balance must peremptorily be provided for by a bill. The purse was found to contain about 13 guineas; and, upon the requisite deductions being made, there remained a sum of £8. This M<sup>r</sup> Duguid protested against as too little; but I was firm: “Better,” I said, “to be turned out, if that even *were* the alternative, than to refuse such petty accounts as those which I had mentioned after having pledged myself to their regular discharge.” At length M<sup>r</sup> Duguid, who insisted that £10 was the very least which could be tendered, closed the question by volunteering to add £2 himself; which £2 of course I was to replace as soon as I received a formal assurance that the transaction was completed. That point being settled, it now appeared that the complement of the < > rent would be £17: a stamp was therefore immediately sent for by the writer [Thursday morning July 18], and a bill \* [at foot of page] was given by me (but guaranteed by M<sup>r</sup> Duguid) for that sum payable on the 25<sup>th</sup> of August.—There closed the transaction, which has never in one iota been since disturbed by me.

On the following Sunday July 21 I saw M<sup>r</sup> Duguid for the last time; he then assured us all that the affair was settled except as to some technical nicety in reducing the offer to writing according to a form prescribed by M<sup>r</sup> Fotheringham. This was the last communication of *any* sort (excepting a note on the following day inclosing a law-paper) that I or any of my family had with M<sup>r</sup> Duguid—verbal or written, direct or indirect—until now after the rent has become due. On Monday July 22 (the day following his last visit) my son waited on him, but found him *not at home*: and upon *all* subsequent calls we were told that he was “gone into the country.” I felt however no uneasiness: his positive assurance had been sufficient to quiet < satisfy > me: and *your* silence coupled with *his* were interpreted < received > by us all as collateral evidences that you had been satisfied, and that the matter was at rest.

I remain, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

THOMAS DE QUINCEY.

\* If, as I *now* suppose, that Bill is not in your hands, then I know not where it is : it was drawn in what struck me as a singular form, but which M<sup>r</sup> Duguid represented as the ordinary Scottish form in a case where the bill was guaranteed by a third party. His rough draught, just as it was copied by me, I still retain.

## III

Monday night, August 26.

GENTLEMEN,

I have still no answer from M<sup>r</sup> Duguid : but instead of an answer he has called out one of my servants, and through her has sent to me your letter of this date without accompanying comment. Pretty nearly at the same time, on sending down to Portobello, I have received M<sup>r</sup> Duguid's letter of the 21<sup>st</sup>. Finding *now*, from the terms of your letter and from the information thence gained of M<sup>r</sup> Duguid's behaviour, that I cannot otherwise protect my own statement from suspicion, I have come to a resolution of inclosing to you his two letters to me [the only letters received from him since the transaction of July <18> 17-18]—viz. that dated <Aug.> 24 *August* [and sent over on Sunday morning by a private messenger] and secondly that dated 21 *August* [which has just been received from the Post-Office at Portobello]. I have unwillingly adopted this step : but, when I see the extent of M<sup>r</sup> Duguid's misrepresentations, and above all when I find him endeavouring to make me a party to my own crimination of urging me to write a letter acknowledging to have "mislaide" [and therefore to have received] letters which never had any existence, and to have "forgotten" conversations which no honest man could pretend to have forgotten had they ever been held,—I do not see what other course I could pursue.

Your interest in this matter being so much less than mine, it is possible that you may not give any very keen attention to the letters : allow me therefore to point out

1. That to *you* M<sup>r</sup> Duguid represents the change in the application of the money as originating with me and my altered directions :—but to *me* he represents it as originating with himself and his own altered views of the legal effects likely to follow the course settled between us. A tender of payment in advance would, it seems, have been "*very injurious to my interest*<*s*>" \* [at foot of page.]

\* Even this last statement, setting aside its contradiction to the



2. In the letter of Aug<sup>t</sup> 24 he speaks of having "both *verbally* and in writing" made me aware of the change : but in that of Aug<sup>t</sup> 21 he speaks only of an imaginary *letter*.

3. To *you*, it seems, he alleged having applied the money to other purposes under my directions. To *me*, on the other hand, you will observe that he makes no such allegation—but only proposes *in future* to do something of the kind : and this proposal is first made on Aug<sup>t</sup> 21—when the affair was just arrived at the point of exposure.

4. These "directions" again from me to apply the money otherwise—how were they communicated ? M<sup>r</sup> Duguid himself <refers to> **describes** his imaginary letter stating the rupture of the transaction [**and the consequent liberation of the money**] as written upon his departure to the country, and as *never having been answered*. 'This imaginary communication therefore, by his own account, was the last communication between us.

5. Waiving however this last point, and supposing my counter directions not to be producible, at least the *receipts* must be producible of any persons paid by M<sup>r</sup> Duguid. Let M<sup>r</sup> Duguid therefore produce receipts for any sums whatever paid on my account *after* July 18.

I may here add—that, except as regards Fees or other official charges, M<sup>r</sup> Duguid has never even professed to have advanced <any> or paid any sums on my account : and with respect to those, on a representation made July 6–7 that the Court of Session would rise on the 9<sup>th</sup>, and that before that event a sum of £8. 3. 4 would be indispensably requisite for <office> dues of court [or else that my legal protection must fail of being obtained before November next],

---

other statement made to yourselves, is of itself monstrous—coming from M<sup>r</sup> Duguid. He had insisted for weeks, with almost offensive vehemence, on this tender of partial payment—as the one thing needful to satisfy either you or the law : so that what opening had he left to himself for saying [as with such careless levity he does] that he had declined to finish the transaction as "*very injurious to my interest*" ?—He had <al> uniformly urged it as the one great means of securing my interest. And he had besides to all of us on Sunday July 21 represented the transaction as <already> **actually** finished except as to some <trivial> **slight** point of form prescribed by M<sup>r</sup> Fotheringham, and therefore as not open to any declinature.

—I paid to him on July 8 the sum of £8. 10. 0. Neither *could* M<sup>r</sup> Duguid be under any doubts as to the course to be taken with the money paid on July 17–18 in the event of your refusing to receive it. He understood my situation : he understood the necessity for punctuality under my circumstances. And his last words to me, on folding up the Bank Notes, were—In case this arrangement should be in anyway defeated, these notes of course revert to you.”

The case is painfully clear : M<sup>r</sup> Duguid, having once allowed himself to appropriate the money confided to his honor, laid his plan thus :—You, for the time, he trusted to satisfy by saying that I had refused the money. Me, whenever the matter should reach my ears, he designed to satisfy—so far as respected the non-settlement of the transaction—by some legal reasons against it ; reasons which, as drawn from Scottish Law, he knew me to be in no condition for estimating. And then, as regarded the money, he hoped to anticipate any question as to what had become of *that*—by insinuating that, if it had not been exactly applied as I directed, he held it however ready to serve my interests as occasion should arise. All this plan was defeated by the accident of my writing directly to yourselves : had the correspondence passed through his hands, doubtless no part of his <scm> scheme would ever have been more than < > suspected.

---

I beg it may be understood that I have no feelings of hostility to M<sup>r</sup> Duguid in making these disclosures. On the contrary, I believe myself to be greatly indebted to his skill, vigilance, and activity in managing my affairs. And even, as regards the money which he has intercepted so discredibly,—as I have no means for ascertaining or even for guessing what proportion may have gone to himself of the sums continually paid into his hands, for anything I know to the contrary he may have had a very good claim upon me for even <more money> a larger sum than he then obtained ; and even the crooked mode he adopted of getting it *may* have originated in reluctance to ask me for money so soon after I had paid him various considerable sums for fees—for stamps—and for alleged compromises more than once with M<sup>r</sup> Lockhart.—<I have> Besides these considerations of justice, I have naturally prudential reasons for avoiding if possible an open rupture with an agent who has my affairs in his hands, and who probably holds against me the

£17 bill meant for yourselves.—All these things considered, I would certainly have been silent on the whole affair, and would willingly have put up with any little momentary loss, had I not found from your letter—that to suffer any mystery to settle on the transaction would involve myself in suspicions of crooked dealing ; and *that* too in a case where I had not only acted with entire frankness and good faith, but also with a severe sacrifice at the moment to what I understood from M<sup>r</sup> Duguid to be the legal necessities of my situation.

Believe me, Gentlemen,  
Your faithful humble Servant,  
THOMAS DE QUINCEY.

## IV

Wednesday August 28.

GENTLEMEN,

In the two letters sent to you this morning I was necessarily occupied with the vexatious question raised by M<sup>r</sup> Duguid's double-dealing. There still remains the question of the House, which (perhaps you will say) is a question wholly aloof from anything relating to M<sup>r</sup> Duguid or his conduct—and to be settled on it's [*sic*] own merits.—I cannot complain, and have no wish to complain, of any measure which may appear to you necessary for Lady Nairne's interest. But surely <the following Proposal> *that* is sufficiently secured by the following Proposal, which seems to endow you with every legal <power advantage which> **power** that you could derive from your own—whilst it offers the further advantage of still securing a tenant to her ladyship, and (I will take the liberty of adding) a much more than ordinary care of her property.—You say that you are willing to allow a month (under a certain condition) for the payment of this quarter's rent : and in fact, having asked for 14 days when I believed myself to owe you only £17, I need 10 or 12 days more when I find that I owe you £27. Now the condition which I propose to you as the substitute for your own is this :—that, according to your own choice, I will pay either £27 <on the> in a month or 40 guineas on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of October [secured of course by a bill] ; and that, upon my failure or delay, I <am> **consent** *now* to sign an agreement, the strongest you can frame, to quit the house in 5 days after, and I will further pledge to you my word of honor

to take no advantage of any legal plea that might by any possibility be raised for evading or delaying the execution of this agreement. I put <in> it in your power, I give you leave, to render me incapable of <again> holding up my head in <honorable> the society of men of honor, if I demur under any pretence whatever to resigning the house after I have failed in the least tittle of my engagements as regards the money.—The same agreement I will renew with regard to all subsequent portions of rent upon your allowing me a reasonable time for paying them ; as, suppose, at the rate of two days for each £1. And in fact I will agree to pay an instalment of £5 every 10 days, provided only that—after each quarter's rent is paid—you allow me an interval of 10 days before the <next> series of payments <commences> recommences.

And further, to give the very strongest proof in my power of the perfect good faith in which I make these proposals,—whereas M<sup>r</sup> Duguid informed me that my present Lease would vitiate and overrule in law any possible subsequent agreement, so long as the two instruments coexisted, I will—upon your assurance as gentlemen (verbally or otherwise conveyed) that you will take no advantage of the surrender excepting only in the case of my violating the terms here proposed—*immediately give up into your hands my existing lease* ; so that no bar of any sort or degree can be imagined, I suppose, to the powers you will have of enforcing the fulfilment of any contract between us. Surely it is possible to shape a contract so as to harmonize the lady Nairne's interest with the very limited demands made on my part—demands so very much below the ordinary standard of those which are **usually** conceded to < > tenants. Suppose for example that, after this present quarter<s> is disposed of, two guineas were paid weekly for ever after ; and so much more for some weeks as would overtake the month (already <in arrear> gone into arrear) of this 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter before that arrangement <could> could take effect. This (or any other) variation of the plan proposed, I will readily consent to—or anything in short by which your Client's claim could be most effectually sustained, or my sincerity most unequivocally expressed.

Before I conclude, allow me to tell you—that you are in error when you say that at such or such time I was on the brink of insolvency. On the contrary I have not, by means of any process pursued for the benefit of a *personal* protection, at any one moment during or after that process been less solvent than before. It

UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF THOMAS DE QUINCEY 185

was not *possible* for me to make myself less solvent ; since whatever I had attempted to resign to my creditors would immediately have been transferred from my <power> control to that of my wife or children. And <g> universally, I <ta> presume, a 'Cessio' is an *exponent* indeed of a past condition of embarrassment, but as an <cause> operative *cause* expresses **surely** nothing else than relief from pressure and <a> therefore an enlarged ability to pay. You seem also to be unaware that *my* Cessio, though unaccountably protracted as to its final step to 1833, <did> was originally instituted as a remedy for difficulties prior to 1832. But, waiving this, how could I in any just sense be described as insolvent, either in the one year or the other, who (with a single exception as to that part of my income locked up until next Christmas, as stated in my last letter) possessed, and could not help possessing, whatever funds at any former <time> time I ever *had* possessed. These funds were not assigned to my creditors, simply because not assignable in law : but they were as certainly available in future, as any freehold property, for <any> debts properly belonging to my family. What I took from the grasp of my creditors was my personal liberty ; and *that* would have availed them nothing. As to my income, I *could not* assign it : but in the hands of my family it is amply available for all the engagements I am now proposing to make, and within a short period for all past debts.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient and very humble serv<sup>t</sup>

THOMAS DE QUINCEY.

[*Endorsed in a different hand* " Mr. De Quincey 28 Aug 1833."]

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### THE VISION OF LEOFRIC AND GREGORY'S DIALOGUES

AMONG the scanty remains of the English saints' legends of the eleventh century is the *Visio Leofrici*, in which is given an account of the other-world wonders seen by Leofric, Earl of Mercia, and of the saint-like particulars of his life.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the most striking feature of this collection of monkish marvels is the description, in that part which treats of his visions, of a narrow bridge across which Leofric is constrained to walk in order to reach a pleasant land beyond a terrible river. For here we have an early occurrence of the bridge of Hell, a detail which appears almost invariably in the other-world visions that flourished in France and England from the twelfth to the fifteenth century.<sup>2</sup> Leofric, in a sleep-like trance, sees a terrible "water."

Him þuhte to soðan on healf-slapendon lichaman, na eallinga swylce on swefne, ac gyt gewisslicor, þ he sceolde nede ofer ane swiðe smale bricge, ⁊ seo wæs swiþe lang, ⁊ þær arn swiðe feorr beneoðan egeslic wæter, swylce hit ea wære. Ða þa he mid þam gedraht wæs, þa cwæð him stefn to, "Ne forhta þu. Eaðe þu þa bricge oferferest." Mid þam þa wearð he sona ofere, nyste he hu. Ða þa he ofere wæs, þa com him lateow ongean ⁊ hyne lædde to anum swyðe wlitigan felde ⁊ swyþe fægeran, mid swetan stence afylled. þa geseah he swyþe mycele weorud swylce on gangdagan, ⁊ þa wæron ealle mid snawhwitum réafe gescrydde, ⁊ þ on þa wisan þe se diacon bið þonne he god-spell ret.<sup>3</sup>

As the source for this passage Professor Gordon Hall Gerould

<sup>1</sup> A. S. Napier, "An Old English Vision of Leofric, Earl of Mercia," *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1907-1910, ii (London, 1909), 180-87. The manuscript is written in a hand of about the year 1100, but it is probably a close copy of a somewhat earlier original (cf. Napier, p. 180). Leofric, one of the three great earls of the kingdom under Harold I and Edward, and a patron of the Church, died in 1057 (cf. *D.N.B.*, under *Leofric*). It is not improbable, then, that the Vision originated sometime during the third quarter of the eleventh century.

<sup>2</sup> The bridge is to be found, for example, in such popular visions as *Tundale, Alberic, Thurchill*, and *St. Patrick's Purgatory*. Cf. E. J. Becker, *A Contribution to the Comparative Study of the Medieval Visions of Heaven and Hell* . . . (Baltimore, 1899), pp. 44, 83, 90, 97.

<sup>3</sup> Napier, p. 182, ll. 1-13.



has suggested the *Visio Pauli*.<sup>1</sup> In that vision the bridge is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the so-called Fourth Latin Redaction,<sup>2</sup> the redaction upon which most of the later French and English visions drew heavily for their basic details.<sup>3</sup> There St. Paul, having seen the tortures near the mouth of Hell, approaches a horrible river.

Postea vidit flumen orribile, in quo multe bestie dyabolice erant quasi pisces in medio maris, que animas peccatrices devorant sine ulla misericordia quasi lupi devorant oves. Et desuper illud flumen est pons, per quem transeunt anime iuste sine ulla dubitacione, et multe peccatrices anime merguntur unaqueque secundum meritum suum.<sup>4</sup>

But Paul Meyer, in his survey of the French redactions of the *Visio Pauli*, came to the conclusion, on the basis of an examination of the dates of a large number of the extant manuscripts, that the Fourth Latin Redaction was probably not written before the twelfth century.<sup>5</sup> If, therefore, this passage could be shown to be source of the bridge episode in the *Vision of Ælfric*, we should have here an important bit of evidence in favour of an earlier dating of the most influential of the Latin redactions of the *Visio Pauli*.<sup>6</sup>

A comparison of the two bridge passages establishes at once the

<sup>1</sup> G. H. Gerould, *Saints' Legends* (Boston and New York, 1916), p. 126.

<sup>2</sup> In addition to the various versions of the *Visio Pauli* which preserve generally the older (i.e. fourth-century) form, there are extant eight Latin redactions which originated in the late Middle Ages. It is upon these Latin redactions, especially Redaction Four, that the popular vernacular versions were based (cf. my *Studies in the Apocalypse of Paul*, a Harvard Doctoral Dissertation (1930), pp. 28-96, 116-41 and 188-99; and Herman Brandes, *Visio S. Pauli* (Halle, 1885), pp. 34-37, 75-80).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Becker, pp. 42, 49 et *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> Brandes, p. 76, ll. 5-10.

<sup>5</sup> P. Meyer, "La Descente de Saint Paul en Enfer, poème français composé en Angleterre," *Romania*, xxiv (1895), 359-60.

<sup>6</sup> Becker, pp. 67-68, cites a passage from Ælfric which he considers to be a quotation from the *Vision of Paul*:

On pyssere andwerdan gelaðunge sind gemengde yfele and gode, swa swa clæne corn mid fulum coccele : ac on ende pyssere worulde se soða Dema hæst his englas gadrian pone coccel byrþenmælum, and awurpan into ðam undwæscendlicum fyre. Byrþenmælum hi gadriað þa synfullan fram þam rihtwisum : þonne ða manslagan beoð togædere getigede innon þam hellicum fyre, and sceapn mid sceapum, gytseras mid gytserum, forliras mid forlirum ; and swa gehwylce mánfulle geferan on þam ecum tintregum samod gewripene cwymliað ; and se clæna hwæte bið gebroht on Godes berne . . . (ed. Thorpe, i, 526).

As this detail is also one of the special characteristics of the Fourth Latin Redaction of the *Vision of Paul* (cf. my *Studies in the Apocalypse of Paul*, pp. 166-72), the quotation might be taken as another bit of evidence for the earlier dating of that redaction. But a similar passage is likewise to be found in the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great (iv, xxv (Migne, lxxxvii, 381)). And since Ælfric elsewhere condemns the *Visio Pauli* (Thorpe, ii, 332), it is likely that Gregory, not the *Vision of Paul*, is his source here.

fact that they differ in two significant particulars: first, the *Vision of Leofric* contains no mention of the "bestie dyabolice . . . que animas peccatrices devorant . . . quasi lupi devorant oves"; and second, the *Visio Pauli* contains no description of a land of "wlitigan felde" in which are "swyfe mycele weorud . . . ealle mid snawhwítum réafe gescrydde." Now, the bridge of Hell had appeared in Western European literature as early as the sixth century in the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great; and by reason of Gregory's profound influence in England, it must have become known there at a very early date.<sup>1</sup> The *Visio Pauli* itself draws upon the *Dialogues* for this detail.<sup>2</sup> If, then, the *Vision of Leofric* be found to be in agreement with the *Dialogues* at both the points at which it differs from the *Visio Pauli*, we may conclude that it is probably based upon Gregory's work.

In the fourth book of the *Dialogues* Gregory recounts the vision of a soldier.

Aiebat enim, sicut tunc res eadem etiam multis innotuit, quia pons erat, sub quo niger atque caliginosus fœtoris intolerabilis nebulam exhalans fluvius decurrebat. Transacto autem ponte, amœna erant prata atque virentia, odoriferis herbarum floribus exornata, in quibus albatorum hominum conventicula esse videbantur.<sup>3</sup>

It is immediately clear not only that this passage agrees with the *Leofric* both in the omission of the "bestie dyabolice" and in the inclusion of the description of the "wlitigan felde," but also that, with reference to the second of these details, the *Leofric* is directly indebted to this passage for its language.

þa geseah hé swyfe mycele weorud swylce on gangdagan, ⁊ þa wæron ealle mid snawhwítum réafe gescrydde, 7 þ on þa wisan þe se diacon bið þonne he godspell ret.

Of Gregory's "albatorum hominum conventicula,"<sup>4</sup> these lines are a perfect realistic paraphrase.<sup>5</sup>

H. T. SILVERSTEIN.

<sup>1</sup> Hans Hecht, *Bischof Waerferth's von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen* (Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa, Hamburg, 1907), pt. 2, 13-18, points out, for example, Bede's indebtedness to the *Dialogues*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Studies in the Apocalypse of Paul*, pp. 166-172.

<sup>3</sup> Cap. xxxvi (Migne, lxxvii, 384).

<sup>4</sup> Du Cange, *Glossarium*, under "Conventicula, 1" (Niort ed., 1883, ii, 545), gives the following information:

Congregatio. Ordinatio Teuderici Abb. Campirotundi ann. 962. in Appendice Marcæ Hispan. col. 882: *Conventiculum Monachorum Christo Domino ibidem servantium aggregavit.*

<sup>5</sup> Waerferth translates Gregory's words thus: "gemetinga ⁊ gesommunga hwittra manna" (Hecht, pt. 1, 319). Whence it is evident that the *Leofric* is following the Latin text directly.

"ROBERT GREENE AND GEORGE A GREENE, THE  
PINNER OF WAKEFIELD"

IN January 1932 the late Mr. Dugdale Sykes in a letter to Professor J. Le Gay Brereton<sup>1</sup> of The University of Sydney quoted some evidence which he had recently discovered as to the authorship of *George a Greene*, and which was supplementary to that given in his article on the subject in *R.E.S.*, vii, 129-136. It seems probable that Mr. Sykes intended, had he lived, to send a note to *R.E.S.* embodying this new material, and Professor Brereton therefore forwarded to me the relevant portions of his letter, which with the consent of Mr. Sykes' executor I am glad to be able to print.

Ed. *R.E.S.*

I was pleased to hear that you have always felt that *George a Greene* has rightly been attributed to Robert Greene.

As you say, the romantic treatment of its theme and the mingling of important historical personages with humble pastoral people is strongly suggestive of his hand, and particularly of the author of the *James IV* play, apart altogether from the definite similarities of phrase and vocabulary that reveal themselves on a close examination of the text of *George a Greene* in conjunction with Greene's undoubted plays.

Since I wrote my *R.E.S.* paper I have discovered several additional links between them which would have been well worth notice.

For instance, though I have pointed out the resemblance between Bonfield's speech to Bettris in *George a Greene*, I, iv, beginning with the words

But, gentle girl, if thou wilt forsake the Pinner  
And be my love

and ending with

If thou wilt love the Lord of Doncaster

and (i) Lambert's to Margaret in *Friar Bacon*, III, iii ("But, Peggy, if thou wed thyself to me . . . If thou wilt be but Lambert's loving wife"), and (ii) Prince Edward's to Margaret in III, i of the same play, ending with "If thou wilt be but Edward's Margaret," I unfortunately overlooked another significant parallel to the *George a Greene* speech in *Alphonsus, King of Arragon*, where (v, iii) Alphonsus addresses Iphigena in like fashion

Nay, virgin, stay. *An if thou wilt vouchsafe  
To entertain Alphonsus' simple suit  
Thou shalt ere long be monarch of the world*

Rich Pactolus, that river of account

Shall be thine own, and all the world beside  
*If you will grant to be Alphonsus' bride.*

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was in page information has been received of Professor Brereton's own death early this year.

Again, though it would be absurd to draw any inference of identity of authorship from the fact that the King of England and the King of Scotland figure among the characters both of *James IV* and *George a Greene*, it is scarcely likely to be a mere coincidence that they address one another in precisely the same way, *i.e.* as "Brother of Scotland" and "Brother of England" respectively—see *James IV*, I, i and *George a Greene*, IV, i (Mermaid edition, pp. 312, 313, and 433).

Oddly enough, at the ends of Act II and of Act IV of *George a Greene*, George uses almost exactly the same words of invitation, in the one case to the Earl of Kendal and in the other to Robin Hood. Here is the later of the two speeches :

Will you to my poor house  
*You shall have wafer-cakes your fill*  
 A piece of beef hung up since Martlemas  
 Mutton and veal : if this like you not  
 Take that you find, or that you bring for me  
(Mermaid edn., p. 442.)

To this Robin Hood replies :

Godamercies, good George  
 I'll be thy guest today

[The Earl of Kendal's reply to the same invitation (on p. 424 of the Mermaid edition) is simply

"Gramercies, George".]

Compare with these two invitations, Margaret's like proffer of hospitality to Lacy at the end of Act I of *Friar Bacon* :

Well, if you choose to come to Fressingfield,  
 Make but a step into the keeper's lodge  
 And such poor fare as woodmen can afford,  
 Butter and cheese, cream and fat venison,  
*You shall have store*, and welcome therewithal

and Lacy's reply :

*Gramercies*, Peggy : look for me ere long.

It is strange (not to say irritating) to find that (after having glued my eyes to the texts of Greene's plays for months before I wrote my article) these useful little bits of evidence escaped my notice.

[H. DUGDALE SYKES.]

## THE BEGINNING OF BARNABE RICH'S MILITARY CAREER : A CORRECTION TO THE *D.N.B.*

ACCORDING to Sidney Lee, Barnabe Rich's military career began about 1555. He writes in his notice of him in the *D.N.B.* that : "Enlisting in boyhood in the army, he engaged in Queen Mary's war with France in 1557-58." And he immediately goes on to

state that : " Writing in 1585 he says : ' It is now thirty yeares sith I became a souldier, from which time I have served the king (*sic*) in all occasions against his enemies in the fieldes ; the rest of the time I have continued in his garrisons. . . . ' (*Adventures of Brusanus*). " As far as can be seen, this was his only evidence in support of his assertion. And it was rather a weak prop to lean upon. Even if one should take the phrase " thirty years " to mean quite precisely and definitely that space of time, it is not at all certain that the passage quoted from *Brusanus* was written in 1585. For *Brusanus* was published in 1592 only. It is true that we learn from the title-page that it was " written by Barnabe Rich seaven or eight yeares sithence, and now published by the great intreaty of divers of his friends, " but this is certainly not enough to free our minds from any doubt whether the thirty years must be counted back from 1585 or from 1592.

Now Sidney Lee would have escaped this difficulty if he had been aware of the existence of another and much more definite pronouncement of Rich's upon the same point. This occurs in an epistle " to the most noble Captaines and renowned Souldiers of England " prefixed to Rich's *A pathway to military practise*, published at London by John Charlewood in 1587. " It is now 24 yeres agoe, " Rich writes there, " sith I first undertooke Armes & served at *Newhaven*, under that most honorable Earle of *Warwicke*. " This gives the date of 1563 as that of the beginning of Rich's military career. And the town which he calls *Newhaven*, in conformity with Elizabethan practice, is the French sea-port of Havre. For Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick, had been made on October 1, 1562, Captain-General of an expedition which sought to seize Havre for Queen Elizabeth. The attempt was unsuccessful, and Warwick capitulated on July 29, 1563. The remnants of his army brought back to London the plague which they had contracted in France, and this may have influenced Rich in whatever he later had to say of the miserable lot of the Queen's soldiers. However this may be, his military career began at Havre between October 1, 1562, and July 29, 1563. A date which agrees with that obtained by counting thirty years back from that of the publication, but not of the composition, of the *Adventures of Brusanus*.

RENÉ PRUVOST.

### SOME NOTES ON REFERENCES TO JOSEPH HALL IN MARSTON'S SATIRES

It is known that Marston's satires contain attacks on Joseph Hall, both as an individual and also, more especially, as the author of *Virgidemiae*. But Marston did not scruple to use Hall's satire as a quarry for words and phrases. Throughout *The Scourge of Villanie* and *Certain Satires* we find a mixture of abuse and borrowing, of echoes and insults. There are many words, phrases, and ideas which strike the reader fresh from *Virgidemiae* as reminiscences of Hall's work. Only a few examples are referred to in the following list. Some of the allusions to Hall have been noticed by Grosart in his *Occasional Issue* edition of Marston's poems, and these I omit, except when I have something to add to Grosart's notes.

he doth sweetly sing  
Gainst *Peters* teares and *Maries* mouing moane  
And like a fierce enraged Boare doth foame  
At sacred Sonnets. O, daring hardiment !  
At *Bartas* sweet Semaines, raile impudent  
At *Hopkins*, *Sternhold*, and the *Scottish King*  
At all Translators that doe strive to bring  
That stranger language to our vulgar tongue.

(Reaction, 36-43)

This attack is prompted by Book I, satire viii, of *Virgidemiae*, where Hall does refer to "*Peters* Teares" and to "*Maries* moane." But the rest of Marston's attack is sheer misrepresentation. Hall does not satirise religious poetry as such. He censures Southwell because he thinks his style unsuitable for religious poetry.<sup>1</sup> Marston's assertion that Hall "railes" at "*Bartas* sweet semaines" is itself a piece of impudent railing; for Du Bartas is never mentioned in Hall's verse, except to be praised.<sup>2</sup> To Hopkins, Sternhold, and the Scottish King there is not the remotest allusion in *Virgidemiae*; but Hall thought it was wise to make it quite plain to James, when the "Scottish King" became King of England as well, that the satire on religious poetry in *Virgidemiae* was not intended to apply to his Royal Highness's translations from Du Bartas. In *The King's Prophecie*, an address published on James's accession, Hall writes :

So may thy work my lowly muse upraise,  
So may mine hie-vp-reared thoughts aspire

<sup>1</sup> Besides the satire in *Virgidemiae*, see Grosart's edition of Hall, p. 195.

<sup>2</sup> *Virgidemiae*, I, iv, 25; Grosart, p. 223, etc.



That not thy *Bartas* selfe, whose sacred layes  
The yeelding world doth with thyself admire,  
Shall passe my song, which nought can reare so hye  
Sauce the sweet influence of thy gracious eye.

(Roxburghe Club reprint, stanza 20)

For tell me *Crittick*, is not *Fiction*  
The soule of Poesies invention ?

. . . . . fie, ignorant  
When as the soule and vitall blood doth rest  
And hath in *Fiction* onely interest ?  
What Satyre ! suck the soule from Poesie  
And leave him spritles ?

(*Reactio*, 87-100)

Here again we have either honest mistake or deliberate misrepresentation. Hall does not reject fiction in poetry. His view is not that of the mediæval and the Puritan critics ; it seems, rather, to be that of Horace. There are several passages in *Virgidemia* to which Marston may be referring, but Hall's views are expressed most clearly in *Virgidemia*, I, iv, 5 *sqq.*

Painters and poets holde your auncient right :  
Write what you will, and write not what you might :  
Their limits be their list, their reason will.

Perhaps these lines are written in the person of the "braver braine" (line 5) who puts them forward in excuse for his romantic flights of fancy. The lines are suggested by Horace :

Pictoribus atque poetis  
quidlibet audendi semper fuit aequa potestas.  
scimus, et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.

(*Ars Poetica*, 9-11)

If the braver brain is speaking, he suppresses the condition under which Horace grants this licence, and Hall supplies the correction :

But if some painter in presuming skill,  
Should paint the stars in center of the earth,  
Could ye forbear some smiles and taunting mirth ?

which is a paraphrase of the first lines in the *Ars Poetica* :

Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam  
jungere si velit. . . .  
spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici ?

It is probably this excess in the poet's invention that Hall censures, and not fiction generally as Marston would have us believe.

Speake yee attentive swaines that heard him never  
Will not his Pastorals indure for ever ?

(*Reactio*, 147-148)

The first line is a parody of Hall's

Speake ye attentive swaynes that heard me late.

(*Defiance to Envy*, 105)

Commenting on Marston's line, Grosart says "Bibliographers and Biographers have lamented needlessly over 'lost Pastorals' of Hall. He only intended to write such" (p. 245). But in *The King's Prophecie* we find:

Virgils  
fourth Egloge  
translated  
and applied  
to the birth  
of Hen. the  
prince.

How did I better long ago presage  
(That ioyes me still I did presage so right)  
When in the wardship of my weaker age  
My puis-nè Muse presumed to recite  
The vatic lines of that *Cumean* Dame  
Which *Maro* falsely sung to *Pollios* name.

(Stanza 17)

This seems sufficient proof that Hall did indeed write at least one pastoral, even if it was only a translation.

*The Scourge of Villanie*, ii, 92 *sqq.*, may be an attack on Hall's college, Emmanuel, where Holy Communion was celebrated in a Puritan way.<sup>1</sup> The references to "Precisians" and to "Athence" are significant. Compare also *Satyra Nova*, 39-40.

What Academicke starued Satyrist  
Would gnaw rez'd Bacon, or with inke black fist  
VWould tosse each muck-heap for som outcast scraps  
Of half-dung bones to stop his yawning chaps?  
Or with a hungry hollow halfe-pin'd iaw  
VWould once a thrice-turn'd bone-pick'd subiect gnaw  
When swarmes of Mountebancks & Bandeti . . .  
Infect our soules with all-polluting euill.

(*Scourge of Villanie*, iii, 111-120)

The satirist in question is Hall. The words "rez'd bacon" are borrowed from *Virgidemiæ*, iv, ii, 36, "reez'd bacon soords." Marston's assertion that Hall's subjects are threadbare is amusing. What a satirist ought to write, says Marston, is such as this:

Shall *Lucea* scorne her husbands luke-warme bed?

(*Scourge of Villanie*, iii, 121)

and this is borrowed without acknowledgment from *Virgidemiæ*:

The close aduress where hir name is red  
Coms crawling from her husbands lukewarm bed.<sup>2</sup>

(iv, i, 144-145)

<sup>1</sup> See Aubrey's *Life of Lancelot Andrewes*; Fuller's *History of Cambridge*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> The original is, of course, Juvenal, vi, 115 *sqq.*

Then there is a passage on simony, which Hall had already satirised (*Virgidemiae*, II, v, etc.). The line :

Shall Curio streake his lims on his daies couch  
(*Scourge of Villanie*, iii, 139)

is also an echo of Hall :

When Lucan streaked on his Marble-bed.<sup>1</sup> (VI, i, 207)

Instead of using his satire to attack these subjects, Hall, according to Marston, wastes his verses on "Martia" (*Scourge of Villanie*, iii, 161), or on "Villius" (*ibid.* 162-165) or on "Lollios sonne" (*ibid.* 166). "Martia" is mentioned in *Virgidemiae*, IV, ii, 47; "Villius," or more correctly, Villius' son, is the subject of Hall's Book V, satire iv; Lollo and his son are treated of in Book IV, satire ii. Marston continues :

. . . any Swine-heards brat, that lousie came  
To luskish Athence, and with farming pots,  
Compiling beds, and scouring greasie spots,  
By chaunce (when he can like taught Parrat cry  
*Deerely belou'd*, vvith simpering grautie)  
Hath got the Farme of some gelt Vicary,  
And now, on cock-horse, gallops iollilie;  
Tickling with some stolne stuffe his sencelesse cure,  
Belching lewd termes gainst all sound littrature.  
(*Scourge of Villanie*, iii, 168-176)

This pretty obviously refers to Hall, but there is some difficulty of explanation. "Swine-heards brat" is not a true account of Hall's parentage. John Aubrey says of Hall that "he was a keeper's son in Norfolke."<sup>2</sup> "Keeper" is an ambiguous word, and it is, perhaps, just possible that there was some current rumour which gave Hall's father a lower social position than was his right. But it is much more probable that Marston is striking at random. "Luskish Athence" we may construe as Marston's Oxford opinion of Cambridge. Hall was kept at Cambridge only by the sacrifice of his family, and he could scarcely have been anything but poor.<sup>3</sup> Quite possibly he had had to do such menial tasks as these with which Marston twits him. The "gelt Vicary" we must take as prophetic. It was not until later that Hall received his first cure,

<sup>1</sup> Source is again Juvenal, vii, 79.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. A. Clark, vol. I, p. 281.

<sup>3</sup> See "Some Specialities," Hall's works, ed. P. Hall, vol. I.

which was, as it happened, a "gelt vicary."<sup>1</sup> With this passage compare *The Scourge of Villanie*, iii, 133 sqq. It was fairly safe for Marston to prophesy an ecclesiastical career for Hall, since Emmanuel was founded specifically to train candidates for the Ministry.<sup>2</sup> The words "Romes filth" in line 178 refer to Hall's satire on Catholicism, "POMH PYMH" (*Virgidemiae*, vi, ii).

Yon Athens Ape (that can but simperingly  
Yaule *Auditores humanissimi*,  
Bound to some seruile imitation,  
Can, with much sweat, patch an Oration,  
Now vp he comes, and with his crooked eye  
Presumes to squint on some faire Poesie. . . .  
My soule adores iudiciall schollership,  
But when to seruile imitatorship  
Some spruce Athenian pen is prentized,  
Tis worse then Apish.

(*Scourge of Villanie*, ix, 21-41)

Hall seems to have been well known as a public speaker. He was successor to Gabriel Harvey in the public lectureship in Rhetoric, and Fuller records that he was "first noted in the University for his ingenuous maintaining . . . of the position that 'Mundus senescit.'"<sup>3</sup> The accusation of "servile imitatorship" is probably based on the numerous borrowings from Juvenal, Persius, and others which are scattered through *Virgidemiae*. But the accusation does not come well from Marston.

Hall occupies in Marston's satires a position similar to that of the still unidentified "Labeo" of *Virgidemiae*. The references noted above, and the more numerous references pointed out by Grosart, show to what an extent Marston relied on personal attacks to fill his satire. We are forced to disbelieve his assertion that he does not satirise individuals. And as a final note, it may be remarked that the prose "To him that hath perused mee," in which he makes his disclaimer, is closely imitated from his victim, Hall's "Postscript to the Reader," in which the author of *Virgidemiae* also protests that there are no personalities in his book.

A. DAVENPORT.

<sup>1</sup> *D.N.B.*, art. Hall.

<sup>2</sup> See Fuller's *History of Cambridge*.

<sup>3</sup> *Worthies*, ed. P. A. Nuttall, 1840, vol. II, p. 231.

### THE PUBLICATION OF CORNWALLIS'S *ESSAYES* AND *PARADOXES*

It is the purpose of this note to clear up a few of the more difficult matters in connection with the bibliography of the works of Sir William Cornwallis, the younger.<sup>1</sup>

The *Essayes* were published by Edmund Matts in two parts, 1600 and 1601. Through a slight miscalculation the signatures (in eights) were not made continuous. Part I ends with two blank leaves, O<sub>3</sub> and O<sub>4</sub>. A *Second part of Essayes* begins with four leaves, the second of which is signed "N<sub>3</sub>." There are twenty-four essays in the second part, numbered 26-43, 45-50.

Matts either anticipated an increased demand and had a larger impression of the second part printed, or he sold copies of the first part before the second was ready; for in 1606 he brought out a new edition of the first part. This edition ends with a blank leaf, M<sub>8</sub>, making the signatures of the volume issued in 1606 continuous. But this issue seems to have left him with extra sheets of the second edition of Part I. On March 1, 1609-1610, his rights in the work were assigned to John Browne, and in 1610 Browne brought out the second edition of Part I with a new title-page, followed by new second editions of Part II and of *Discourses vpon Seneca the Tragedian*.<sup>2</sup> The signatures in this volume are continuous. The numbering of the essays in Part II is corrected, and essays 50-52 are added.

The last edition of the *Essayes* and *Discourses* was published by John Marriott in 1632. The general title-page (on which there is an engraving by T. Cecil) is dated 1632. In some copies Marriott's name appears in full, and in some only the initials. There is no special title-page for the first part. The title-page of Part II differs. The earlier form reads: "... Printed by *Tho. Harper*, and are to be sold/ by *Ambrose Ritherdon* . . ." Ritherdon's shop was condemned in 1631, and he was unable to relocate (see McKerrow, *Dict. of Printers*). The second form reads: "... Printed by *Tho.*

<sup>1</sup> For a complete but concise list, see my letter in *The Times Literary Supplement*, December 4, 1930, p. 1042, and Mr. P. B. Whitt's comment in the issue of January 22, 1931. The "Instructions to —, Embassadour to Spain, by —," mentioned by Mr. Whitt, is probably by no member of the Cornwallis family. It was written by one whose brother (not father) had been an ambassador, but not necessarily or even probably to Spain.

<sup>2</sup> First published by Matts in 1601. The contents of the first edition should include a dedication, a table, and a page of errata. Sigs. ¶, ¶<sup>1</sup> are lacking in some copies.

*Harper, for Iohn Marriot . . .*" Both are dated 1631, as is the separate title-page of the *Discourses*. As nearly as I can determine the title-page of Part II was not completely reset. In this edition the dedication of Part II and the dedication of the *Discourses* are omitted.

Shortly after the author's death in June 1614, Richard Hawkins got possession of two of his paradoxes or encomiums, on Sadness and on Julian the Apostate. They were entered to him on December 23, 1614, and in 1616 he published them as *Essayes Or rather Encomions*. In the same year Thomas Thorp published four other paradoxes as *Essayes of Certaine Paradoxes*, and on November 15, 1616, he assigned them to Hawkins, who, in 1617, published a new edition of them, which he issued with the 1616 edition of *Essayes Or rather Encomions*. He retained the title-page of the latter in the new issue, but the title-page of the second edition of the *Paradoxes* (*Essayes Of Certaine Paradoxes. The second Impression, enlarged*) was intended as a general title-page, and it has on the verso a table for both parts of the volume.<sup>1</sup>

R. E. BENNETT.

#### A NEW MANUSCRIPT VERSION OF DRYDEN'S EPILOGUE TO *SIR FOPLING FLUTTER*

In Volume I of the *Review of English Studies* (pp. 325-26) Mr. Thorn-Drury published variant readings for Dryden's epilogue to *Sir Fopling Flutter* which he had noted in a version of the epilogue in the Haward MS. Two of these variations Mr. Brett-Smith adopted in his edition of the *Dramatic Works of Sir George Etherege*. I do not think it has been observed that the Sloane MS. 1458 at the British Museum contains another version of Dryden's epilogue which in some particulars seems to be nearer still to what its author originally intended.

<sup>1</sup> Four of Cornwallis's paradoxes (written earlier) escaped the printer, and are preserved in Sir Stephen Powle's commonplace book, MS. Tanner 169 (folios 132-37). When editing these [see *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology*, xiii (1931), 219-40], two facts escaped me. It is probable that, like the preceding entry in Powle's book, "The 1<sup>st</sup> of Leycester his common wealth," they were "copied of yonge S<sup>r</sup> william Cornwallly[s] written booke." The copy occurs among entries made between 1608 and 1613, and in close proximity to entries made about 1611. Mrs. Evelyn Simpson has called to my attention a manuscript (Rawlinson D718, No. 2) of *The Praise of Richard the Third*, which corresponds with the Hardwick Hall manuscript in having a dedication to John Donne and a short preface, which are not in other manuscripts or the printed editions.



The manuscript consists of poetical pieces and extracts collected by Richard Enock who matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1673. The book was compiled while he was an undergraduate, for it bears the date 1677, with his signature, on the first page.

The following are the chief variations from the readings in the quartos and in the Haward MS.

l. 6. That, Gallants, *hee* may more resemble you  
(for *they* in the quarto and *it* in the Haward MS.).

l. 10. I *vow* methinks hee's pretty company  
(this corresponds with the quarto reading rejected by Mr. Brett-Smith, as a printer's error, in favour of the version in the Haward MS., I [*i.e.* Ay] *now* methinks).

l. 16 (14 in the quarto) makes nonsense as it stands,  
To fill and finish God almighty, Fool  
(but the *fill* for *file* gives some authority to the Scott-Saintsbury reading of the line).

The couplet referring to Dryden himself, omitted in the published play, appears as in the Haward MS., though in a different position. The last seven couplets differ in sequence from the arrangement in the other versions. Their order is, I think, a more logical one. The two climatic lines

Yet none S<sup>t</sup> Fopling him, or him can call  
Hee's knight o' th' Sheir, and represents you all

conclude the account of the beau's representative character. The four lines describing his "diving Bow" follow the description of the "new French wallow," thus placing the entire picture of his demeanour before the account of his dress and his songs—"the Ladies dear delight."

WILLARD THORP.

### LYRICAL BALLADS, A VARIANT?

ANY peculiarity in the 1798 issue of *Lyrical Ballads* is of importance to students and to collectors of Wordsworth and Coleridge.

In "A Description of the Wordsworth and Coleridge Manuscripts in the Possession of Mr. T. Norton Longman," London, 1897, p. 44, W. Hale White quoted from a letter written by Coleridge to Biggs, who was printing the 1800 edition of *Lyrical Ballads*, the

following regarding verse 56 of the *Tintern Abbey Lines*: ". . . p. 204, last line but two. Be careful that the last word of this line be printed 'woods' and not 'wood' as in some of the copies." White remarks that this is "additional evidence that alterations must have been made in the 1798 edition while it was passing through the press."

In the 1798 issues the word "woods" on p. 204 occurs at the end of a very long line (56) running out to near the margin of the type page. Line 58 is another extra long line, precisely the length of l. 56, and is the last on the page—a most dangerous point for loss or slipping or crushing or a poor impression of letters. The Noel Douglas replica (London and New York, 1927) of the Southey Bristol copy in the British Museum shows at the end of l. 56 "wood" without the 's' or the comma that should follow it; and this replica has at the end of l. 58 "though" with a space for the missing final 't,' and after the space a dot representing a comma. The space and the dot in place of the 't' and the comma are seemingly due to a displacement of the type for 't' and of the type for the comma.

My copy of the London issue of 1798 reads correctly "woods" with a comma and "thought" with a comma—perfectly good impressions. Professor Broughton informs me that the Bristol copy at Cornell has "woods" with 's' slightly defective, followed by a defective comma perhaps touched up with a pen, and "thought" with a comma; that the two London copies at Cornell have "wood" with 's' added or touched up with a pen, followed by a faint shadow of a comma; and that both London copies have "though" with 't' added or touched up with a pen, one copy with a defective impression of a comma, the other with a shadow of an original comma.

The perfect readings of both lines in my London copy, and the complete readings in the Cornell Bristol copy, considered with the nature of the poor readings in the Southey Bristol copy and the Cornell London copies, indicate that the variant impressions are due not to changes in the type, but to variations in the position of the loose types at the ends of the unusually long lines, or to varying unevenness of the pressure brought to bear at these troublesome points. The Douglas replica shows that there are imperfections at the end of some other lines of this poem in the Southey copy. Coleridge's expression, "in some of the copies," shows that he found variations between copies such as have just been noted; but

apparently the copies he saw had good impressions of "thought" and its comma. His letter to Biggs apparently sought a correct printing of an original reading "woods"—it did not substitute a new reading of "woods" for "wood."

The ink corrections in the Cornell copies may have been made by owners of the copies or by the printer or the publisher after Coleridge or Wordsworth had discovered the poor impressions in some copies. Mr. Potts (*Academy*, January 6, 1906) pointed out that in practically all copies the error "Oft" at 1798, p. 19 (*Ancient Mariner*, 1798, l. 200; final text, l. 202), is corrected with a small tick by a pen to "Off"—apparently at the printer's or the publisher's.

In the London *Times Literary Supplement* of June 23, 1932, I have discussed certain other variants.

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### DRYDEN'S ESSAY OF DRAMATIC POESY

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

SIR,

It is very generally, and perhaps wisely, considered that to reply to the attack of even an accredited reviewer of a book in question is too often singularly profitless, and therefore I might well be excused if I were to treat the elaborately spiteful philippic which Mr. E. S. de Beer has directed against me in your October number with the contempt which in my opinion it so amply merits. It has been pointed out to me, none the less, that my silence would be misunderstood by those who are so pitifully anxious to misunderstand. However, I certainly am not minded to waste many words on the thing.

The sum of Mr. de Beer's contention seems to be that in assigning quotations to their contexts and in the exact description of particular places I have given the same references and mentioned the same localities as previous annotators of Dryden's *Of Dramatick Poesie*. Ingenuously enough he speaks of "common property" in this connection, and he cannot appreciate that these very words absolutely cut the ground from under his feet.

In reference to a quotation I make from Scaliger's *Poetics* he writes, "but he has seen the original"; and again with regard to another quotation he has, "it is probable that Mr. Summers has seen the original text." Both comments, and they do not stand alone in their kind, can hardly fail to strike a reader as gratuitously offensive.

Mr. de Beer is pleased to remark, "The superiority of the notes to *Aureng-Zebe* is due to their being largely taken from Mr. Kenneth Deighton's edition, 1892." This, of course, is merely said for the sake of the sneer. *Aureng-Zebe* is among the easiest of Dryden's plays to annotate. It would not have suited Mr. de Beer's purpose to speak of the comedies or the political dramas, any one of which owing to the multiplicity and often the obscurity of topical allusions

presents exceptional difficulties, and no one of which has (in any real sense) been annotated before. Yet if I am to believe the many letters of congratulation I have been happy to receive, I am sufficiently rewarded by the applause and approval of scholars and literary men.

The suggestion that I have "deliberately depreciated the work of [my] predecessors in order to conceal [my] borrowings from them" is as unworthy as it is untrue.

It is significant that Mr. de Beer should go out of his way to assail my Dryden nine months after publication, and I cannot but feel that the temper of his methods must defeat his own purpose.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS.

[The foregoing letter has been shown in proof to Mr. E. S. de Beer, who writes as follows:]

The Editor, *Review of English Studies*.

SIR,

Finding it stated in the *Sunday Times* that some of Mr. Summers's notes on Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* were derived from W. P. Ker's edition, I looked further into the matter, with the result that I convinced myself that the statement was true, and that Mr. Summers had taken material from other editors as well, not only without acknowledgement, but either disparaging their work or passing over it in silence. It seemed to me that, if such were the facts, they should be made public. It is for your readers to decide whether my note gives a fair statement of the facts and, if so, how far it is justifiable.

E. S. DE BEER.

## REVIEWS

**Beowulf.** An Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a discussion of the stories of Offa and Finn. Second edition. By R. W. CHAMBERS. Cambridge University Press. 1932. Pp. xvi+565. 25s. net.

It would be difficult to name a book at once so generally satisfying and so stimulating as was the first edition of this work, which appeared eleven years ago. In it we were given in a form agreeable to read a complete set of *Beowulf* documents (originals and accurate translations), and a full account of the outstanding problems (other than purely textual) of the poem, together with an exhaustive bibliography of the literature of every aspect of the subjects presented. This was all done in a manner which combined wide and yet well-controlled learning with vividness of style; the book told us all that we could reasonably want to know—interpreting the terms “introduction” and “discussion” of its title in the widest sense—in an attractively discursive style, yet made the reader wish for more of the same kind: it presented the views of rival theorists with a tireless fairmindedness, and yet left no doubt in our minds as to Dr. Chambers’ own views and tendencies. If the arrangement of the work as a whole was not always conveniently methodical, this seemed but a small drawback—the inevitable result of interruption, caused by the late European war—beside the consistent excellence of the book as a whole. When the author resumed his work after the War, part of the book had remained already in proof for some years and could not then be seriously altered; and though Professor Chambers has sought to indicate the small changes that have taken place in his views in the light of later thought and discovery by added footnotes in this second edition and by a small new section of additional notes, the necessity of retaining the plates of the first edition has prevented any substantial alteration or re-casting of the book.

In the eleven years that have passed since the publication of Dr. Chambers’ first edition, its outstanding excellence has become apparent to all students of *Beowulf* and kindred subjects. As an



introduction and a discussion—all that it claims to be—it is unequalled and indispensable. It only remains, therefore, to point out the special features of the second edition, which is, as explained above, not so much a revision as an augmentation of the first.

The principal feature of the new edition, which is indeed its *raison d'être*, is an entirely additional fifth part of more than 100 pages, entitled "Recent work on *Beowulf* to 1930." This continues and supplements the discussion of the historical, archæological and "folkloristic" problems set forth in the first edition (omitting only the question of the Finn Episode for reasons stated in the Preface) in the light of all that has been written about *Beowulf* during the intervening years. It also contains a section of "additions to the Bibliography" covering the same period. The book is now, therefore, a complete survey of *Beowulf* studies fully documented down to 1930—complete, that is to say, except for the deliberate omission of the problem of Finn.

One cannot but regret Professor Chambers' fastidiousness in the last-mentioned matter. "I do not see my way," he tells us, "at present to any satisfactory solutions." But this fascinating problem is, as Dr. Chambers recognises in his new Preface, just the one which, since his first edition, has received in the "elaborate study of Professor R. A. Williams," the fullest re-examination; and it is beyond question that Dr. Chambers would have greatly helped, as well as entertained his readers, by a new discussion of this fundamental matter. The retention in this new edition of the traditional, but hardly justifiable spelling *Finnsburg* was doubtless due to purely typographical exigencies. The Preface gives "Finnesburh" without comment, and Hickes' form "Finnsburuh" is probably to be regarded as a later spelling of the name slightly deranged by his typical (cf. Dr. Chambers' useful note on p. 245) omission of the *e*. Part III, dealing at length with the Finn Episode and related questions, has therefore received no important addition. But, apart from the ingenious hypothesis of Professor R. A. Williams mentioned above, there is the (to the reviewer) attractive possibility that there were Jutes on *both* sides in the Finnesburh fight. Materials provided by Professor H. M. Chadwick in his *Origin of the English Nation* provide even more ground than he himself seems to have realised for the view that the Hengest of the *Episode* and the *Finn Fragment* should be identified with the historical Hengest, the "exile" of Nennius' narrative who conquered Kent from Vortigern;

and, on the other side, there may be significance in the fact that Finn, as the son of Folcwalda, is only known to English history from the *Kentish* genealogy supplied by the *Historia Brittonum*. The term "Half-dane" may cover Jutes serving as mercenaries under a Danish prince and therefore participating in his feuds, and Finn may be himself a Jute while ruling over Frisians and retaining a party of Jutes in his service. The blood-feud between even kinsmen was not unknown to Old English history when the related men happened to have taken service under different lords, as the famous entry in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* concerning the slaying of Cynewulf of Wessex (under date 755) clearly shows. At least, the hypothesis of Jutes on either side in the Finnesburh fight may be shown to fit in with all the known facts, and therefore to merit full examination.

Yet, if Dr. Chambers has seemed over-cautious in declining to re-open the problem of Finn in *Beowulf*, he has written with convincing force and definiteness in his handling of the problem of the Scandinavian peoples of *Beowulf* which forms the second chapter in his new fifth part, in which, incidentally (p. 440) he utters a most timely protest against those critics who hold "That everything is uncertain, but that in the meanwhile all theories are interesting." Here Professor Chambers makes available to English readers the pioneering work of Dr. B. Nerman in his re-construction of early Swedish history (*Det Svenska Rikets Uppkomst*, 1925), wherein it is made plain once for all that *Beowulf* is a primary document for actual Scandinavian history (cf. especially p. 419 of Dr. Chambers' book). The excavation of Ottar's burial-mound, briefly noticed in the first edition, which gives the death-blow to the theory that the *Geatas* of the Poem were Jutes, since Ottar *Vendel-Crow* was actually buried in the Swedish, not the Jutish Vendel, is now set forth fully; and one may fairly hope that the new section entitled "The *Geatas* once more" marks the final establishment of the view, which philologists have usually supported, that the *Geatas* of *Beowulf* are to be identified with the Norse *Gautar* (*Göter*) and have nothing to do with the Jutes.

Professor Chambers' handling of the new historical and archaeological material—material which is mainly provided by Scandinavian scholars—shows the author at his best in the marshalling of complicated facts and in courteous controversy; and that is saying a very great deal.

The third chapter of the new part of Dr. Chambers' book, on "The Non-historical Elements," is valuable for its thoroughness and completeness, though this kind of investigation does not seem to have yielded much of definite usefulness for the study of the Poem since the first edition was published. Of analogues to *Beowulf* there is no end, and the new folklore material is scarcely likely to interest many besides the folklorists.

In viewing Dr. Chambers' book as a whole in its newly augmented form, the impression is one of a work of amazingly consistent excellence, whether in the matter or the manner—a work in which any scholar might justly feel pride as his life's accomplished task. Yet this book is but a part, and perhaps not the greater part, of that vast debt which all students of English literature owe to him. When he has given us so much, it may seem ungracious to ask for more. But, apart from the *Finn Episode* already discussed, there are two matters in which the treatment was so general in the first edition of the book that further elaboration might have seemed desirable. These are the problems of the language of the Poem and of its structure (Sections 2 and 3 of the third chapter in Part I). Even in an introductory discussion it would have been worth while to have set forth with some illustration the possibilities as to the linguistic and textual history of *Beowulf*. Certainly, the palæographical evidence (which seems to favour a Mercian origin) might be thought too fine a matter for consideration here; but at least some clearer indication and examples of the types of evidence bearing on the dialect of the original would not have been out of place. The one historical English name in the Poem, too, is that of Offa; and this mention of the Anglian ancestor of Offa, the dominating Mercian monarch of the latter part of the eighth century, would be most easily explicable if *Beowulf* were a Mercian poem. Nothing in the dialectal evidence (shadowy though this is at best) precludes this view, which has the advantage of conveniently linking up—however slenderly—with the unique suggestion of actually English history in the Poem.

But far more important is the other matter but briefly touched upon in the first edition which we should have liked to have seen fully set forth. This is the question of *Beowulf* as a purely formal technical achievement. For without such a consideration, one can hardly hope to discuss effectively the structure of the Poem. There is, in the character of the hero himself, something which creates an

essential unity in *Beowulf*. This embodiment of the Germanic ideal—the spirit which struggles against powers of evil who will, he knows, ultimately overwhelm him and his, and for that very reason fights the harder—looks back when dying over his long life with gratification, though he knows that his efforts cannot avert the final doom which impends on his people; for he knows that he has lived the right life. And is not the Poet, in setting forth Beowulf's fights, really giving us the story of "Humanum Genus," but with a heathen Germanic instead of a Christian ending as in *The Castel of Perseverance*? Byrhtwold's words in the poem on *The Battle of Maldon*, which must have existed in some form centuries before they were put into the mouth of that late tenth-century hero, express that ideal which is the unifying force in *Beowulf*:

Hige sceal þe heardra, heorte þe cenre,  
mod sceal þe mare, þe ure mægen lytlað.

Then, too, something more is to be seen in the metre of *Beowulf* than a means of establishing the date of its composition. Its consideration might well throw light on the structure of the Poem.

Dr. Chambers has brought his admirable bibliography down to 1930 by a new section of additions; and, as one would expect, it is complete and thorough in every detail, even including some items the value of which many a less scrupulous investigator would have overlooked. One item in it deserves, perhaps, more attention than it has received; for it might well be worth while to examine further Mr. W. Sewell's proposal (in the *Times Literary Supplement* for September 11, 1924) to connect the words *egsode eorl(as)* of l. 6 with the *(H)eruli*. Dr. Chambers' convincing arguments against Professor Wessén's reconstruction of early Scandinavian history (pp. 434 ff.) would be still further strengthened if *Scyld Scefing* should prove to have been a terrifier of the *(H)eruli*.

It would be superfluous in a book issued from the University Press of Cambridge to enlarge on the excellence of the printing and the make-up; but attention must be drawn to the added illustrations of the new edition, which definitely increase its value. Few, indeed, are the misprints, and none of them of any importance. On p. 438 the title of the book *Vor Folkegruppe Gottjod* is mispunctuated, and the form *brác* on p. 468 is evidently a misprint for *bræc*.

Dr. Chambers has been too modest in calling his book an

"Introduction." It is this and far more. For though it is so written that every type of student of our early literature will derive full value from whatever time he spends on it, it is also certain that it will be the indispensable companion of even the most erudite of Beowulf-researchers. No library can afford to be without it.

C. L. WRENN.

**The Growth of Literature.** By H. MUNRO CHADWICK and N. KERSHAW CHADWICK. Vol. I. The Ancient Literatures of Europe. Cambridge University Press. 1932. Pp. xx+672. 30s. net.

GISSING in *New Grub Street* represents Marian Yule one day in the British Museum reading-room, her head sunk in her hands, overcome by the heavy atmosphere, wondering what was the use of her work, when there was already more good literature in the world than any mortal could cope with in his lifetime. "To write—was not that the joy and privilege of one who had an urgent message for the world? Her father, she knew well, had no such message; he had abandoned all thought of original production, and only wrote about writing. She herself would throw away her pen with joy but for the need of earning money." Professors of English literature do not generally write from Marian Yule's hope of earning money, nor are they, on the other hand, often oppressed by her despondency. Nowadays their position authorises, in fact enjoins, the production of books. But those who read or even buy them, must now and then stop to inquire into the special object and usefulness of each work as it is added to the already overwhelming total of authorities on every subject. The book before us is the first of a projected series which certainly claims to have a definite purpose. The authors are going to discover and propound the laws of literary production. They are going to examine and compare the *genres* as they have sprung up in different countries and ages. If so, we shall expect to realise that human sentiments and ideals do not altogether express themselves like the wind that bloweth where it listeth, nor find their form in any haphazard fashion, according to the impulse or individuality of the artist. The work will surely do more than emphasise the influence of the historical background.

It will no doubt demonstrate that the poetry which moves our imagination is subjected to laws.

There is something grandiose in the conception. Whenever literature has been introduced as an academic subject there has generally arisen a fear that, as a study, it hardly satisfies the highest activities of the intellect. Even Plato, perhaps the greatest of all stylists, objected that though its inspiration came from God, man applied the influence to excite his emotions, whereas the deepest truths vouchsafed to human beings could be reached only through dialectic. But to go back no further than the nineteenth century, Peacock, rather disillusioned in the personalities of the romantic movement, argued that we are too civilised to rely upon poetic intuition; the modern man should cultivate the insight of reason. John Stuart Mill was an earnest student of poetry, but he valued Wordsworth and Tennyson as complements and compensations for the austere and impersonal labour of the intellect. During the last fifty years the study of literature has become more professional. Academic criticism has immensely enlarged and systematised our knowledge, but most often on the plea that the sentiments and literary methods of the past were worth preserving for their own sake. Such was Furnivall's conviction when he founded the Early English Text Society. Students were trustees of an inheritance. But now, if Professor Chadwick's scheme is carried through to completion, it would look as if the study of literature is at last to be raised to the dignity of a science or even of a philosophy—as if we shall no longer be left wondering at the movements of the human spirit, but shall be able to trace—and also to explain—the progressive stages of its struggle into conscious form, and having mastered its evolution we can become master of our own national past.

So it might be hoped, and the two collaborators have inaugurated their laborious enterprises by investigating the material which may well involve the most scholarly research and expert judgment, but should certainly yield the secrets which are most worth discovering. They have begun with the "ancient literatures," which developed and found their natural expression before the arts of composition came under the influence of Latin, in fact, before poetry was fixed and formalised in manuscript; for our ancestors had probably learnt the art of writing for centuries before they thought of recording their verse. In those days, "a man's memory



was his library." It is an age of fascinating mystery. But when the reader has opened this thick volume and has read through the first few chapters, he will hardly be able to repress a feeling of disappointment. These scholarly pages, so closely packed with erudition and acute observations, are only a compilation, a work of preparation for future humanists. The result might have been so different. The authors must have read every scrap of prehistoric verse in Greek, Old English, Irish, Icelandic and Norse, and they have succeeded in classifying their features as Type A—narrative poems; Type B—poems dealing with situation or emotion; Type C—poems of didactic interest; Type D—"celebration" poetry; Type E—poetry relating to the poet's own feelings or experience. Similarly, the characteristics of the nameless poets are systematised by the phases through which early literature seems to have passed. Phase I represents the intellectual life—primarily the entertainment—of court circles in the days of military kingship. Phase II represents the activities of the learned in barbaric times, and is intended for instruction. Phase III is the product of more advanced and complex conditions, which cannot well be brought under one head. Such a classification seems a little mechanical and the wording is not inspired, but, at any rate, it will be noticed that the multitudinous and multifarious relics of ancient cultures are not denominationalised according to countries or centuries, but according to the interests, art and vision of the creators. The Chadwicks have worked in a scientific spirit, guided by archeological experience, and having collected with such insight and industry these scattered fragments and facts, they have grouped them according to kinship of mood and circumstance; and thus interpreted, the data assume, or should assume, a new significance. If only a poet could have been let loose on all this academic material!

Professor Chadwick made the first trial of his subject twenty years ago in his *Heroic Age*, which, despite its pedestrian style, has captured many disciples. That book discussed only the Achæans and Anglo-Saxons, yet astonished and inspired one by the unexpected parallels and affinities which were revealed. The ages of Achilles, Odysseus and Beowulf were rescued from the tombs of modern sentiment, and restored to their own heroic life. *The Growth of Literature* has a vastly wider scope. Yet it has lost the earlier imagination and sympathy. Any observant idler, who takes a walk over the most uninteresting country, must from time to time have

passed a muddy pool to the surface of which bubbles are rising from some minute tragedy in its depths, or have noticed a blade of coarse grass which is quivering through some insect conflict at its base. So it is, or should be, with the study of old relics of literature. At any moment we encounter a fact which hides a secret, for instance, the conflict of dialects in Old English manuscripts. Yet all we are told is "the tendency seems rather to be for non-West Saxon forms to occur in archaic or poetic words, while words which belong to the language of everyday life usually appear in the normal late West Saxon forms." Or take the influence of the priesthood which played no small part in both the Achean and Teutonic poetry of Phase II. The Chadwicks tell us, "In both cases we find at the beginning of the historical period a class—quite unorganised—of learned poets or sages, distinct from professional seers or priests. In both cases the history of intellectual life—or, perhaps we should say, of synthetic thought—seems to be bound up with this class. Yet the history of this class, like that of the *filid*, who represent the intellectual life of early Ireland, must be traced back apparently to the learning of the seer; neither Hesiod nor the *spakir menn*, any more than the *filid*, have parted with their mantic associations." What faithful and meticulous capacity for generalisation, what incapacity to give it life!

So the reader must resign himself to look not so much for an idea of the human spirit which arose out of the conflicts and aspirations of primitive civilisation, as for the materials out of which the idea may one day be created. The Chadwicks throw no light on the epic hero's oscillation between self-reliance and superstition, on the warrior's dream of immortality, on his conception of the deities who had all for which he strove, on the difference between Achean and Northern supernaturalism, on the differences between the Greek muse and the manticism of the Teutons, on the love of horses and the arts of war. What a lot we should have liked to learn about Apollo and Othin, and of the influences which led the spirit of poetry from the chieftain's circle of sworn warriors to the common folk and thence into the hands of the copyists. *The Growth of Literature* certainly makes the reader aware of these phenomena, but does not suggest the causes, nor help him to feel the romance. But let us be thankful for what we have got—an immense amount of specialised knowledge systematised and rendered accessible, and a demonstration of the science of comparison which

prepares the student for what may happen in one field by discovering what has happened in another.

But oh for an Ezekiel who feels "the hand of the Lord upon him" even in the Valley of Dry Bones, and has the vision to see the fragments come together, revive and stand up, "an exceeding great army."

H. V. ROUTH.

**Winner and Waster.** Edited by Sir ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. 2nd Edition. Pp. 58.

**Death and Liffe.** Edited by Sir ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. Pp. xvi+38. (Select Early English Poems, III and V.) Oxford University Press. 1931. 5s. each.

THESE TWO books were published after the death of Sir Israel Gollancz and were seen through the press by Dr. Mabel Day, who has supplied a preface to the second of them. Their appearance affords a welcome opportunity of expressing the gratitude which all students of our early literature feel towards Sir Israel Gollancz for his long and fruitful labours in this field. Not only did he spend his own energies in the recovery and elucidation of much that was previously buried in obscurity, but, by his position as Honorary Director of the Early English Text Society, he was able to inspire the work of many younger scholars.

The first edition of *Winner and Waster* in the series of Select Early English Poems appeared in 1920 and was very fully reviewed then, notably by Steadman in *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 36, and by Hulbert in *Modern Philology*, Vol. 18. This second edition is substantially the same as the first, but certain misreadings of the manuscript, which Steadman noted in the first edition, have been corrected in the later one. The most important are l. 377, *towne* (first ed., *towns*); l. 477, *tauerne* (first ed., *tonne*); l. 483, *sege* (first ed., *sete*). In some lines the text remains unaltered, but the correct manuscript reading is given in the notes (cf. ll. 300, 302, 434). Words which have not been altered according to Steadman's suggestions, and have received no comment, are: l. 254, *raton(e)s* (Steadman, *ratoūs* = *ratouns*; cf. also l. 399, *grant*; l. 405, *lande*, where Steadman reads *ū* instead of *n*); l. 340, *cleuen* (Steadman,

*clouen*) ; l. 496, *chese* (Steadman, *chefe*). It must be supposed that, in these instances, Sir Israel Gollancz satisfied himself that Steadman's readings of the manuscript were incorrect.

The objections made in several reviews of the first edition to the too numerous emendations in the text have not resulted in a decrease in their number. It may be regretted that, especially in ll. 445-47, no notice has been taken of the defence of the manuscript readings which certain reviewers offered.

This tendency to excessive emendation is also a feature of the text of *Death and Liffe*. Hanford and Steadman, whose edition of this poem appeared in 1918 (in *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 15), spoke of the manuscript text (preserved in the Percy Folio Manuscript) as "corrupt beyond the powers of a modern editor to restore, or even, in some cases, to explain," and contented themselves with reproducing the manuscript with only a few obviously necessary alterations. The result was not always satisfactory, since, in some passages, their text fails to make sense. It is clearly the duty of an editor to wrestle with the problems presented by such passages, and Sir Israel Gollancz has not flinched from the task. Since, in his edition, the manuscript readings are always given, no general objection can be made to his attempts to restore the sense of the poem, whatever may be thought of particular emendations. Emendation for the purpose of "restoring" the metre or alliteration is, however, a much more doubtful proceeding, and most of the emendations in the present edition are of this kind. Dr. Day tells us in her preface that the editor attempted "to get as near as possible to the original words of the poem, on the assumption that the alliteration was originally of the standard form *aaax* used by careful metrists." This assumption lay at the root of many of the emendations suggested by the earliest commentators on the poem, and Hanford and Steadman, in their edition (p. 258), pointed out then that it was a dangerous one. In view of the statistics provided in Mr. Oakden's book, *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English* (1930), it seems impossible to maintain it any longer. Analysing alliterative poems of the later Middle English period, he finds that no poem shows 100 per cent. of such lines (*The Destruction of Troy* comes nearest to it with 99.9 per cent.). Judging from his figures, the average works out at about 73 per cent., and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that most of the later poets did not even aim at perfection in the matter.

The following lines in *Death and Liffe*, which have been emended in this edition for the sake of the alliteration, should probably be allowed to stand as they are in the manuscript (at least as far as the alliteration is concerned) :

1. Lines showing the alliterative type *aa/xa* : ll. 28, 321.
2. Alliterative type *ax/aa* : ll. 18, 221, 295.
3. Alliterative type *xa/ax* : ll. 40, 69, 167, 314, 411, 458.
4. Alliterative type *ax/ax* : ll. 48, 132, 239, 251, 284, 447.
5. Alliterative type *xa/aa* : l. 192.
6. Alliterative type *aa/bb* : ll. 30, 130, 184, 207, 262, 354 ; or *ab/ba* : l. 285.
7. Alliterative type *aa/xx* : ll. 101, 121, 168, 291, 300, 317, 355, 362, 401 ; or *aaa/xx* : l. 196 ; or *aax/xx* : l. 156.

According to Mr. Oakden, most of these types are found in Old English poetry, and those that are failures (*e.g.* *aa/xx*, etc.) are so common in later Middle English verse as to justify the view that the poets were responsible for them and that they are not due to mere scribal interference.

Several of the emendations in this edition are due to the editor's desire to alter a line which shows the repetition of a word or the use of two similar words in close proximity. Such are the alterations in ll. 27, 62, 84-86, 195, 282. Whether or not we agree with the hypothesis that the author was too careful a poet to have allowed these repetitions, it is surely better to leave the manuscript reading than to substitute something which we can never be sure the author wrote.

The alterations of the verbal inflexions are designed to avoid obvious mistakes. In the manuscript the 3rd pers. sg. pres. indic. ends in *-eth* and *-es*, the latter being much less frequent than the former. Gollancz does not touch any of these endings. The 2nd pers. sg. ends in the manuscript in *-es* (*-s*) six times, *-est* (*-st*) seven times, and *-eth* ten times. The last ending Gollancz emends to *-es* in all cases, but he leaves the *-est* forms unaltered. Dr. Day has argued in her preface to the present edition that the original form was *-es* in both the 2nd and 3rd pers. sg. and that some scribe, when altering the 3rd pers. sg. to *-eth*, carelessly altered many of the 2nd sg. forms in the same way. If this is true, all 2nd sg. and 3rd sg. forms should have been altered to *-es*, since, in this edition, Sir Israel Gollancz is attempting to restore the readings of the original. On the other hand, if, as is arguable (cf. Oakden, p. 100), *-es* and

-est forms existed in the 2nd sg., and -es and -eth in the 3rd sg. in the original poem, it is not safe to emend all 2nd sg. forms in -eth to -es. Clearly, the best course would again be to leave the endings untouched and comment on them in a note.

Several other emendations in this edition invite criticism. It is unnecessary to emend *lowly* (l. 82) to *lovly*, since *w* is often substituted by scribes for *v*; *wright* (l. 238) = "right," should not be altered to *right*, unless *rougt* (l. 239) and *retch* (l. 246) are altered to *wrought* and *wretch*. A scribe has confused *wr* and *r*, indicating that in his speech *wr* had become *r*, and this confusion should either be allowed to remain and should receive comment, or should be eliminated from the text altogether. A few alterations seem to have been made with an almost complete disregard of the manuscript readings. The following may be noted as examples:

(1) l. 25, MS. *broad on their bankes*; Gollancz, *Lan[ce]d broad on their b[r]an[ch]es*. The editor quotes the suggestions made by previous scholars that the first word may be *leaned* or *layd*, or that it may be the preterite of *lendan* (to remain), and then adds, "According to my view, the word is due to a scribal error for 'lanced,' and was vaguely taken to mean 'meadow-land'; hence the further change of 'branches' to 'bankes.'"

(2) l. 196, MS. *when the heard wapen*; Gollancz, *when the [f]eard waxen*. Gollancz maintains that the MS. reading of the last word is *waxen*, but to the present reviewer the word seems to be *wapen*. It is quite possible, as Hanford and Steadman pointed out, to keep the manuscript reading (including *wapen*) and translate "when they heard [the] weapons." (H. S. note that *wapen* = *weapons* in *Wars of Alexander*, 65.)

Of the emendations that are justifiable, a number have been adopted from previous editors and commentators, beginning with Percy himself, and though a general reference is given to such earlier work, attribution of particular emendations to their source is not usually made.

Among the new emendations one may commend *greithlye* for *greatlye* (l. 3, cf. l. 17); and perhaps the bold but ingenious *herf* (l. 100), which makes sense of an otherwise pointless line.

There are some passages in the poem which remain obscure in spite of all attempts to interpret or alter them. The following suggestions are made, very tentatively, for the emendation or interpretation of three of them:



1. ll. 5-9. In order to understand the poet's idea it is necessary to quote the manuscript reading from l. 3 onwards. It runs :

- 3 giue vs grace on the ground the greatlye to serve  
for that royall red blood that rann ff from thy side  
5 & take away of thy winne word as the world asketh  
that is richer of renowne rents or others  
7 for boldnesse of body nor blythenesse of hart  
coninge of Clearkes ne cost vpon earth  
9 but all wasteth away & werthes to nought  
when death driueth att the doore. . . .

l. 5 can be simply emended if we suppose that *take away* is a mistake for *take the way*, and that *word* and *world* have been transposed by a scribe (*world* is so often written *word* that confusion would be easy). *Take* is probably an infinitive, and we may either suppose that *to* is to be understood before it or that it has been omitted by a scribe who did not understand the line. It is possible that *of* in l. 6 has been substituted for *than* as the result of the confusion of *word* and *world* in the line above. Gollancz's insertion of *nis* before *boldnesse* in l. 7 helps to clear up the sense in ll. 7-9.

2. l. 33, MS. *thus prest I on apace vnder the greene hawthorne*. Previous commentators have noted that the sense of this line does not fit the context and that the alliteration is not regular. Their attempts at emendation have mostly been unconvincing, because in "restoring" the alliteration they have had to alter so much. If we allow that the original form of the line may have been a failure from the point of view of alliteration (like those noted under 7 above), and concentrate merely on improving the sense, the solution seems easy. In ll. 28-29 the poet describes himself wandering by a river ; in ll. 30-31 he settles down under a hawthorn to look longer at the stream (l. 32) ; the difficulty with l. 33 is that it seems to ignore ll. 30-31, and describes the poet again wandering about, whereas three lines further on he is falling asleep as he sits. L. 33 seems to have got out of place ; if it is inserted before l. 30 the whole passage runs more smoothly, as follows :

- (l. 26) & a riuer that was rich runn over the greene  
with still sturring streames that streamed ffull bright  
over the glittering ground as I there glode  
methought itt Lenghtened my liffe to looke on the bankes  
(l. 33) thus prest I on a pace vnder the greene hawthorne  
(l. 30) then among the sayre flowers I settled me to sitt  
vnder a huge hawthorne that hore was of blossomes. . . .

The objection is that this transposition gives us two consecutive lines (ll. 32 and 34 in the present edition) with the same alliteration, but since this is found elsewhere (e.g. ll. 118-19), it is not a serious one.

3. l. 101. This is not a matter of emendation but of interpretation. Furnivall and Hales (*Percy Folio Manuscript*) record the manuscript reading as *Sir Hope & Sir Hind yee sturdye beene both* and Hanford and Steadman agree; Gollancz, however, records *pee* instead of *yee*. If we can agree that, whatever the scribe of the Percy Folio Manuscript may have intended, the form that he had before him was *pee*, we can assume either that *pee* = *pe* (the) which is several times used in this poem as the unstressed form of "they," or that *p'* was mistaken by a scribe for *p* and then altered further to *pee*. Either "they" or "that" would make sense of this line.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

**The Inns of Court and Early English Drama.** By A. WIGFALL GREEN. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. 8vo. Pp. xiii+199. 13s. 6d.

THIS book has a highly misleading title, arousing expectations which it largely fails to gratify. On opening it one naturally looks with anticipatory relish for a fresh evaluation of Inns-of-Court drama and its affinities, showing how far they proved contributory to the great national flow, together with some considered opinion on moot points, such as Cunliffe's theory postulating Italian influence in the shaping of the tragic dumb shows. But on none of these points does one receive any enlightenment. The dramatic content of the book is what a commercial traveller working on commission would denominate a mere side-line. Mr. Green's scheme compels him to place the drama in the background of his picture, where it is certainly in its true perspective in relation to the multiform interests of early Inns-of-Court life, but where, of necessity, its outlines must be blurred. His primary concern is with the origin, organisation and traditions of these time-honoured legal guilds, but he spares us nothing concerning the ceremonial and the prodigality of their members, not to speak of their periodical savagery and debauchery.

By dint of well-chosen extracts from more or less familiar records, he succeeds in piecing together a bold mosaic of old Inns-of-Court life, but there all the merit in his work ends. From no point of view can it be considered a contribution to knowledge. But even a compilation deserves to be carefully written, and not with the intermittent slovenliness into which Mr. Green falls. He has a bewildering trick of sliding up and down the years and of jumping with acrobatic celerity from inn to inn in the one sentence. Most irritating of all, the book has a profusion of superfluous footnotes, one of which attains the incomprehensible (p. 103, note 16).

The undue prominence given to the drama in his title serves only to draw attention to the well-demonstrated fact that Mr. Green's knowledge of dramatic history is painfully elementary. Some of his *obiter dicta* on this score are of a quite astonishing naiveté. Concerning Browne's two uncommonly relevant antimasques of animals in *Ulysses and Circe*, we are told (p. 114) that "it was only his close friendship with the gentlemen of the Inn that permitted Browne this liberty of transforming them so." Whether the old Inns-of-Court men would have looked upon it as an indignity to be asked to masquerade as stags and baboons is a nice question, but, as a matter of fact, we have no positive evidence that they ever masqueraded thus, and it is well established that in the Jacobean court masques all the characters in the antimasques were sustained either by professional players or by boys. It is a mistake to assume that all the acting, dancing and singing in Inns-of-Court masques, whether given in an inn hall or court, was sustained by Inns-of-Court men. There is evidence to show that in Caroline times many outsiders were employed. Mr. Green, by the way, says nothing about the intricate reactionary staging of *Ulysses and Circe*, whose description is rendered puzzling to the uninitiated by the application of the word "stage" throughout to the raised dancing place which fronted the two scenic scaffolds, and never in its ordinary sense.

Again and again we encounter a curious infelicity of phrasing, as on p. 143, where we are told, as if the play had been submitted to the popular suffrage, that "*Gorboduc* was the first tragedy to be produced successfully on the stage." This statement is on a par with the one made on p. 153, where we learn of *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, somewhat to our surprise, that "its principal importance, however, probably lies in the fact that it presented to the theatre for the first time the Arthur legend." One gem of purest ray I quote

without comment. Relative to *Gorboduc*, we read on p. 143: "The drama is divided into five acts, a custom which we have almost uniformly observed to the present time." On the ensuing page, Sackville and Norton are accused of having, in 1562, "violated the unity of place," a remarkable feat, if true, since that particular unity had then no existence. It was first deduced from the two Aristotelean unities by Castelvetro in 1570, and, although proclaimed in France by Jean de la Taille in 1572, was not advanced in England until the publication of Sidney's *Defence of Poetry* in 1584.

Credence is given in the book to old fallacies and false interpretations made of early records. The statement advanced on p. 7 that Bacon was "the chief contriver" of Beaumont's masque of 1613 is not borne out by Beaumont's dedication of the masque, and is contradicted by Mr. Green himself later. At p. 61 we are given an interesting citation from the Inner Temple accounts of 1682 of a payment "For Sweetmeats for Madam Gwin, 11.," and told in an accompanying note that Nelly acted at the Inner Temple on January 12, 1682, but she had then long retired from the stage, and could only have been present on that occasion as a guest. So too, some fifty pages later, Mr. Green echoes Warton's silly surmise that Milton derived inspiration for his *Comus* from Browne's masque of 1615, though the absurdity of that idea might have struck him had he paused to reflect that Browne's masque lay *perdu* until its publication in 1772.

Many of the explanations in the book fail to explain. At p. 111 Mr. Green tries a fall with a puzzle which nonplussed that fine scholar the late Herbert Arthur Evans, and comes off no better in the encounter. It concerns the character of Fretelyne in the second antimasque in *The Masque of Flowers*. Woefully wide of the mark is his non-committal gloss, "perhaps a friskier or dancer." Like the lean and slippered Pantaloon who figures in the same antimasque, Fritellino was a contemporary commedia dell'arte type, and an inscribed depiction of him is to be found among Callot's sketches of the Italian drolls. For a reproduction of this, see Joseph Gregor, *Wiener szenische Kunst*, band ii, das Bühnenkostum (1925), Plate 73.

In his final chapter Mr. Green gives us an absorbing list of the plays acted by professionals at the various Inns of Court up to 1688. It has mostly been compiled from Inderwick and is not offered as exhaustive, but without much troublesome research it might have

been readily and usefully extended. *E.g.* in *The St. James's Evening Post* of December 15-18, 1733, is a paragraph running :

We hear that the Gentlemen Benchers of the Temple have bespoke the Comedy called *Love for Love*, written by Mr. Congreve, to be performed by the Comedians acting under the Master of the Revels in the Hay-market, at the Inner Temple Hall on Twelfth Night.

In connection with the listed performances of *The Comedy of Errors* at Gray's Inn Hall in 1594 and of *Twelfth Night* in the Middle Temple Hall in 1601, it is worthy of note that both plays have been given within living memory in the same halls in quasi-Elizabethan style by the Elizabethan Stage Society, the first on December 6, 1895, and the second on February 12, 1897.

Mr. Green's record of the performance of *The Countryman* of Davenant at the Inner Temple Hall on November 5, 1657, arcuses speculation, despite his silence on the point, seeing that no play of Davenant's bearing that title has come down to us. It is a pity also that he overlooked Davenant's prologue for *The Adventures of Five Hours* when Tuke's play was given at the Temple in 1663, preserved in the Davenant Folio at p. 339, if only because it refers to the Templars' habit of sitting on the stage and so far impeding the action that, in plays where swords were used, accidents were liable to happen.

The Yale University Press must set its house in order. In publishing this book it has done Mr. Green a cruel kindness and derogated its own reputation. The printing is excellent, but one marvels over the taste which could illustrate a sober historical treatise in part with second-hand fancy sketches.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

**The Essential Shakespeare.** By J. DOVER WILSON. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1932. Pp. x+148. 3s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR DOVER WILSON has written a refreshing and stimulating, if in some respects a questionable little book, the purport of which he sums up in the words, "Here, in a nutshell, is the kind of man I take Shakespeare to have been." He is at pains to confute certain views on Shakespeare and his plays which, if they are generally held, deserve to be exposed, and he says not a little in a pleasant and entirely readable manner which is well worth saying. At the

same time he occasionally expresses opinions which give one pause. Thus, while we readily admit that "the Comedies came first," and "the Shakespeare of *King Lear* and *The Tempest* grew out of the Shakespeare who gave us *Berowne* and the *Bastard*," it is not quite true that criticism has hitherto ignored this truth; while the spirit of the Romantic Comedies is far from comprehended in the phrase "the verve and gusto of their gay indecorum." Indecency, according to earlier standards, plays a very small part in Shakespeare's dramatic work, while we seem to remember that certain passages, frankly indecent and out of harmony with their surroundings, have been ruled out as interpolations in the edition of the plays for which Professor Wilson is in part responsible.

The transition from comedy to tragedy, and again the abrogation of tragedy at the close of the poet's career, is not easily accounted for, unless we resort to plain guess-work, by reference to his personal history, or to the influence on Shakespeare's work shed by public events such as the beheading of the Earl of Essex. This, we must believe, "shook men's souls with terror and amazement as at some monstrous disaster in the skies." After all, when we seek to depict the "essential Shakespeare" we are under a special obligation to confine ourselves to established fact and to avoid anything of the nature of conjecture. That Shakespeare's relations with Essex were ever of an intimate character we do not know in the least; even where Southampton is concerned there is not much to go on. That the Sonnets were addressed to Southampton is a question seriously doubted by a scholar so cautious as Sir Edmund Chambers; and this is enough to prevent us from regarding the point as settled. Above all, we must not identify Shakespeare himself with any of his characters, or their passions with his own. It is not in any way true to assert that "Shakespeare came very near madness in *Lear*." To believe this one must forget the meaning of the play as a whole in our absorption in the main character, and one must completely ignore those comparatively minor figures, Kent and Edgar, whom the poet places beside Lear, and who prove to us that from beginning to end he has maintained a firm intellectual grasp on the movement of the theme.

These and some other similar "personal prepossessions" one naturally finds in this book, but taking it by and large it is an excellent introduction to Shakespeare, and one which not only the beginner would do well to consult.



There appears to be a slight slip on page 110, where September 1598 is said to be the date of the "first recorded performance of *Julius Caesar*." September 1599 is the date when Platter saw the play, probably at the Globe. *Every Man in his Humour* was acted a year previously.

MARK HUNTER.<sup>1</sup>

**Shakespeare och Sverige intill 1800-talets mitt.** Av NILS MOLIN. Gothenburg. 1931. Pp. iv+308. 6 Kronor.

A DETAILED survey of Shakespeare in Sweden has hitherto been lacking and Dr. Molin's task was well worth undertaking. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there were some Swedes who took an interest in English literature and consequently in Shakespeare. Among these was Peter Julius Coyet, at one time Swedish ambassador in London, whose library, when catalogued in 1696-99, contained a copy of the second folio. Urban Hiärne also possessed a Shakespeare folio, though whether the first or the second is not known. The inventory of the property of Magnus Lagerström, the director of the East India Company at Gothenburg, who died in 1759, includes a copy of the first folio; and Count Carl Gustaf Tessin, as the auction catalogue of his library in 1771 shows, also owned the folio of 1623. These copies seem to have disappeared, but it is possible that one of them may yet be found, as in 1904 a unique copy of a *Titus Andronicus* quarto was discovered in the south of Sweden.

However, English was but little known in Sweden, even in the eighteenth century. The university library at Upsala did not acquire a translation of Shakespeare until 1780, and it was seven years later before the original, in Theobald's edition, was presented to it; while the library at the sister university of Lund had no Shakespeare at all until 1806. Fragments were translated in 1789 and the 'nineties, but the translators were handicapped either by their imperfect command of English or by their literary prepossessions. Gradually, however, some knowledge of Shakespeare filtered through various channels, as may be seen by the references to him in the periodicals of the time, and Garrick's festival in 1769 contributed to the growth

<sup>1</sup> Owing to Sir Mark Hunter's much regretted death in September last, it has been necessary to print this review without his corrections.—Ed. R. E. S.

of Swedish interest in Shakespeare, as it did on the Continent. It is clear that the partisans of French taste, guided especially by the later utterances of Voltaire, did not approve of the new type of drama. Leopold is typical. In his eyes Shakespeare is an "altogether crude, solitary backwoodsman, who, even in outward appearance, differs greatly from others." But another generation sprang up, and in the first decade of the nineteenth century a clash between the old and the new views took place. With the romantic movement the German critics ousted the French from their dominant position as the arbiters of literary taste and the Sweden owed much to A. W. von Schlegel, Tieck and Friedrich Ast, the follower of Schelling. On the other hand, and that is a matter of regret, Coleridge, Lamb and Hazlitt remained to them a closed book.

In view of what has been said, it is surprising to find that Shakespeare was acted in Sweden earlier than in Norway and Denmark, where no performances occurred until the nineteenth century. The versions of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* in question were, however, generally based on the French text of Ducis, though in 1787 a performance of *Hamlet* at Gothenburg is recorded, which apparently went back to the English original. Stockholm lagged behind the provinces. *Othello* was acted there in French in 1802, but it was only in 1819 that *Hamlet* was given in Swedish and won a great success. *Othello* followed in 1827, but owing to the patchwork translation was such a disastrous failure that eleven years passed before another experiment was made with *Macbeth*. In 1845 and 1847 came *Romeo and Juliet* and *King Lear*, but at this time some doubt was felt as to the future of Shakespeare on the Swedish stage. All such misgivings were dispelled by the remarkable translation of Hagberg, which began to appear in 1847 and firmly established Shakespeare in Sweden.

It is impossible to examine in detail the influence of Shakespeare on Swedish drama and still less on Swedish literature as a whole, but some indication may be given. Even in the eighteenth century traces are manifest—bodies are brought on the stage, inflammatory speeches like that of Mark Antony over Julius Cæsar occur, soliloquies in Hamlet's vein, crowd scenes and ghosts also appear, while attention is directed to Swedish history for the choice of a theme. Later, in addition to strengthening historical drama, Shakespeare's influence encouraged plays on Old Norse themes and also the saga-

play, which was connected with folk-lore and drew inspiration from Shakespeare's fairies and witches.

After outlining, however imperfectly, Dr. Molin's book, it only remains to pay tribute to its admirable thoroughness and accuracy. It might perhaps be mentioned that he hardly does full justice to Coyet's outstanding position as a collector of English books. As Johan Nordström has shown (*Samlaren*, 1921, p. 196), the bills from English booksellers and bookbinders during the years 1650-57, still in existence at Copenhagen, prove that Coyet, while ambassador in England, developed a lively interest in English literature, which was most unusual in his day. One other criticism concerns the occasional repetition which is to be observed, as when Beskow's defence of *Torkel Knutsson* by citing Shakespeare's authority is quoted on p. 249 and again on p. 257. In conclusion, may we express the hope that Dr. Molin will continue his survey beyond 1850?

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

**Shakespeare Association Facsimiles.** London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. 6s. net each.

1. **A Dialogue Concerning Witches and Witchcraftes.** By GEORGE GIFFORD. With an introduction by BEATRICE WHITE. Pp. x+[96].
2. **Skialetheia; or a Shadow of Truth in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres.** By E. GUILPIN. With an introduction by G. B. HARRISON. Pp. x+[70].
3. **A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Serving-Men.** By I. M. With an introduction by A. V. JUDGES. Pp. xvi+[74].
4. **Vicissitudo Rerum.** By JOHN NORDEN. With an introduction by D. C. COLLINS. Pp. xviii+[48].

THIS series of facsimiles of "rare texts illustrating life and thought in Shakespeare's England" is published under the general editorship of Dr. G. B. Harrison, who, with the Shakespeare Association, will earn the gratitude of all readers interested in the subject, as the books reproduced are often very difficult of access.

To *The Dialogue Concerning Witches and Witchcraftes* Miss White contributes a brief but excellent introduction, the main purpose of which is to show that the unfortunate creatures actually condemned as witches or suspected to be such in Elizabethan England were ordinary and prosaic when compared with the more imaginative embodiments of evil portrayed in *Macbeth*. Even current rumour, a likely source of exaggeration, credited these living witches with few darker deeds than the imposition of sickness on man or beast; nor was their association with Satan suspected to be closer than through the medium of some animal or vermin, such as a cat, mouse or weasel. The book bears out Miss White's view and has the added interest that Gifford, a minister of God's word, obviously doubted the justice of the convictions of these so-called witches. There are several passages of lively narrative, as for example:

There came in an other, a little fellowe that was very earnest, me thinkes I see him yet. He tooke his oath directly that she was a witch: I did once anger her sarde (*sic*) he, but I did repent me: for I looked somewhat would follow. And the next night, I saw the vgliest sight that euer I saw: I awaked suddainely out of my sleepe, and there was me thought a great face, as bigge as they vse to set vp in the signe of the Saracens-head, looked full in my face. I was scarce mine owne man two dayes after.

Dr. Harrison's introduction to *Skialetheia* leaves little to be said. He gives a short account of the verse satires which appeared towards the end of Elizabeth's reign and consolidates the case for Guilpin's authorship of *Skialetheia*. This book is of particular interest to students of Elizabethan social life because of the detailed, at times somewhat bitter, descriptions of the men, women, fashions and fancies of that age:

The Cittie is the mappe of vanities,  
The marte of foolles, the *Magazin* of gullies,  
The painters shop of Antickes: walke in Poules,  
And but obserue the sundry kindes of shapes,  
Th'wilt sweare that London is as rich in apes  
As *Affricke Tabraca*: One wries his face.  
This fellows wrie necke is his better grace.  
He coynd in newer mint of fashion,  
With the right Spanish shrugge shewes passion.

In an interesting introduction to *A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Serving-Men*, the authorship of which is still uncertain,

Mr. A. V. Judges discusses the Elizabethan "servant question." The "decay of Hospitalitie and Good-housekeeping" in that period brought "bane and bayle to the Butterie and Bordes ende, which both being fallen into a consumption, a cureless disease, there restes no Phisicke helpes to recouer their decaying members." The tract itself voices the discontent prevalent among serving-men of that day, and the author appears to write both with sincerity and from experience.

*Vicissitudo Rerum* is of particular interest in view of the attention now being given by scholars to the question of the relationship between astrology and literature in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Mr. D. C. Collins prefaces the reproduction of *Vicissitudo Rerum* by a description of John Norden as an author (as a map-maker he is, of course, well known). This is followed by an interesting account of Elizabethan theories regarding the universe, and of the popular association of movements of the heavenly bodies with national events.

It cannot be said, however, that the Replika Process employed is entirely satisfactory. The reproductions contain a large number of smudged passages which are wearying to the eye, while letters have frequently lost head or tail. These faults occur in many places where the copy from which the reproduction has been made is perfect.

When so much enjoyment is provided it seems ungracious to call attention to slips in proof-reading; it seems, however, a pity that such an excellent series should be marred by the slightest inaccuracies:

*A Dialogue Concerning Witches, etc.*, p. x, "edtion" for "edition."

*Skialetheia*, p. viii, "hopw" for "hope."

*Vicissitudo Rerum*, p. vi, "insconstant" for "inconstant."

p. xvi, "like a waning tyde" for "like wauing tyde."

p. xvi, "griefe" for "griefe."

The next three facsimiles to be issued are *A Short Treatise of Hunting*, by Sir Thomas Cockaine; *Paradoxes of Defence*, by George Silver, and *Present Remedies against the Plague*.

MARGARET DOWLING.

**A Garland for John Donne, 1631-1931.** Edited by THEODORE SPENCER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. viii+202. 14s. net.

It is a pity that the writers of these tercentenary essays are more interested in Donne's personality than in his poetry. The absence of any complete essay on the qualities of his verse gives the book an unbalanced effect.

Mr. T. S. Eliot's essay on *Donne in Our Time* tells us nothing new and scarcely deserves the place of honour. Mrs. Simpson shows more fully than in her *Prose Works of John Donne* that the *Paradoxes and Problems* illustrate Donne's varying moods between 1598 and 1607. Signor Praz produces from his capacious knowledge of European literature some interesting metaphysical parallels of Donne's thoughts and ideas. Miss Ramsay accounts for Donne's sense of intellectual insecurity by showing his reliance upon certain tenets of mediæval philosophy which the New Philosophy had called in doubt. Mr. Williamson shows how the poetry of Donne has affected modern verse. Mr. Spencer uses Donne as an illustration of the changing spirit of his time, and finds occasion to develop a very interesting parallel between Hamlet's delay and Donne's condition during the years intervening between his marriage and his taking holy orders.

Mr. Sparrow's and Mr. Hayward's essays will have a more limited appeal. Mr. Sparrow's deals with the date of Donne's travels and is the most satisfying solution of that difficult problem which has yet been published. He shows very convincingly that the most probable date for them is the period December 1594 to June 1596, and he is able by an ingenious explanation to make Walton's mystifying account support his conclusion. He should have given more consideration, I think, to the months July 1593 to March 1594 as a subordinate period of travel. I have noticed only one error in this very capable piece of work; the superscription of Sermon XIV (*LXXX Sermons*) shows that Donne returned from Germany at least as early as February 1619-20 and not as late as December 1620, which Mr. Sparrow suggests.

Mr. Hayward's article on the relation of the printed and the spoken word in Donne's Sermons seems to have been written contemporaneously with Mr. Sparrow's article on the same subject in vol. xvi of the English Association's *Essays and Studies*, neither



scholar knowing of the other's work. Both come to very much the same conclusions, that Donne preached from notes, but that he was reproducing "in extenso the more or less definitive version of the sermon he had prepared in his study." But certain differences make a final account desirable: Mr. Sparrow would seem to admit the existence of a perfect copy before preaching more readily than Mr. Hayward, and what about the text of *Death's Duell*? Mr. Hayward suggests that the text (I suppose he refers to the 1632 text) is derived from a MS. prepared by Donne before delivery. Mr. Sparrow believes that the 1632 and the folio texts have no immediate common ancestor. It is a pity Mr. Hayward could not have based his article on Mr. Sparrow's work and thus, by avoiding much of the same ground, have saved space for a fuller exposition of the collations of *Six Sermons* and *Fifty Sermons* with which he concludes his essay. As they stand, his claim that these collations "bring us into closer touch with Donne at the actual moment of preaching" is extravagant. Mr. Hayward is inclined to estimate Donne's sermons too highly. Their value lies in such passages as Mr. Pearsall Smith has selected, not in their learning which is uneasily carried, nor in their textual analyses which Donne uses, not from "intellectual pride" as Mr. Hayward suggests, but (I rather suspect) because it was the fashion. That textual analyses need not be the "low levels" to which Donne reduces them any reader of Andrewes knows.

JOHN BUTT.

**The Manuscript of Milton's "Paradise Lost" (Book I).**

Edited by HELEN DARBISHIRE. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1931. Pp. xlvii+74 (38 pp. facsimiles). 30s. net.

MISS DARBISHIRE has done a piece of work of the greatest interest and importance for any one concerned for the accuracy of the text of *Paradise Lost*, or who would appreciate the fineness of Milton's unrivalled ear for verse, the care he took to indicate to readers the correct pronunciation of words, the rhetoric of his sentences, and the music of his verse—all inseparably bound up together. A fortunate chance has preserved the manuscript from which the First Book of *Paradise Lost* was printed. This was preserved by the printer because it bore upon it the Imprimatur

of the Licenser and was thus the printer's security against possible prosecution, if a work by the notorious defender of regicide should provoke censure. The manuscript passed through the hands of five successive printers and was, in 1732, used by Jacob Tonson to vindicate the accuracy of the printed text against Bentley's censure and rash emendations. Miss Darbishire has printed in full Tonson's interesting letter. The manuscript is now in the great Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, where so many and various treasures are preserved and made available to serious students.

Miss Darbishire's Introduction describes the manuscript, proves its actual use by the printer, and examines the handwriting of, and the inks used by, the first copyists and the various correctors who, most probably at Milton's instance, revised the copy from time to time before it was delivered to the printer. One of these correctors, she shows, was probably Milton's nephew, Edward Phillips. Regarding one correction, that on l. 756 of "capitoll" to "capitall," she seems to think this was made by an unauthorised person who was not one of the four correctors whom she traces in the body of the corrections. As a fact, the difference of handwriting and of inks used (the last factor cannot be reproduced in the collytype) is not of great importance in the study of this particular manuscript, because no suggestion has been made either of forgeries (like those of Collier in another case) or of different strata of corrections, such as are manifest in the manuscript version of *Comus*, preserved at Trinity College, Cambridge. Here some of the corrections have been made *before*, others *after*, Lawes made his transcript and arrangement for the actual performance of the masque. In this case it would obviously be interesting to compare the inks used, though the chief use of such a comparison is, as Doctor Tannenbaum has shown, to detect forgeries made at a much later period.

It cannot be said that the manuscript helps us to any important corrections of the text, for little or no correction is needed. The only emendation which Miss Darbishire suggests is that of "capitoll" for "capitall" in the line referred to. The former reading was that of the original copyist, the correction, or corruption, is in another hand. The chief interest of the manuscript is the light which it throws upon Milton's wishes regarding spelling, and to a less extent punctuation. One cannot but wish that to Milton had fallen the lot of preparing a dictionary likely to determine the

future of English spelling, rather than to Dr. Johnson with his classical prejudices and his colossal ignorance of the history of our language. Miss Darbishire is a little severe on my preliminary effort to widen the survey of Milton's spelling (Beeching did not go beyond *Paradise Lost*) and to support Richardson's claim for the edition of 1674 at least so far as to insist that an editor should take this edition as the basis of his work, but, as I said, "with constant reference to the first edition." I am interested to note that the great Columbia edition of Milton accepts the second edition of *Paradise Lost* as its foundation. It is a little harsh, also, to describe me as "championing" certain readings, because I thought that something could be said for each of them, that they ought not to be dismissed at sight. But Miss Darbishire did not gather from my introduction that my conclusion as to the superiority of the 1674 text came, not at the beginning, but at the end of my work on the poem. My edition was not begun as a scientific edition for scholars but as a handsomely printed edition for the general reader. It was set up from Beeching's reprint of the first edition, with alterations which I made with two ends in view, first, to avoid giving trouble to a general reader by unnecessary old spellings (this was probably a mistake), and secondly, by preserving Milton's own spelling of certain words, to bring how he wished to have these pronounced—as "perfet," "wrauth," "hunderd," etc.—and also the distinction which he wished to make between different forms of the same word when emphasised and when slurred. It was only when I came to compare my text with that of the second edition that I became fully aware how much correction Milton had himself secured when revising the original. My work was somewhat hastily done, and my examination of the spelling in the prose pamphlets was the work of two days in the British Museum when I was on my way to France. I welcome the important additions Miss Darbishire has made to my survey, especially the very interesting detail (pp. 31-32) about Milton's rules for the spelling of the final "ed" of the preterite or the past participle—"ed" when a full syllable, "d" when the elided "e" was needed to indicate the length of the preceding vowel, and simply "d" when the "e" is not required for either of these purposes. She quotes from Book V two lines which illustrate the three rules :

Her unadorned golden tresses wore  
Disheveld but in wanton ringlets wav'd.

To an editor wishing to know exactly how far to follow the editions in reproducing Milton's fad (as one is tempted to call it) of spelling "thir" for "their" when unemphatic or enclitic; and "hee," "mee," "yee," when these pronouns are emphasised; the manuscript affords rather uncertain guidance. Milton evidently drove it well into the head of the copyist that "thir" would be the most usual form. In consequence he writes "thir" sixty-two times, "their" four times, if my counting is correct. The printer of the first edition neglected this spelling consistently up to l. 481, when either his conscience or some proof-reader began to worry him, and he set himself to print "thir" with increasing success. Altogether, of the sixty-two "thirs" of the manuscript (as reproduced by Miss Darbishire) the first edition reproduced twenty-nine (again allowing for some small margin of error in my counting). The printer of the second edition (1674), working either to the dictation of the poet or, more probably, with the manuscript before him, restored some fifty-seven of the "thirs." It retains "their" in l. 267:

And call them not with us to share their part

where "their" certainly is emphasised, and again at l. 499 where there is no emphasis. At l. 505 a change in the reading has eliminated the pronoun.

In the representation of this particular crochet of Milton's the manuscript is thus more correct than the first edition; and the editor of the second edition seems to have corrected the first by a fresh reference to our manuscript. As regards the other, however, the distinction between emphatic and unemphatic pronouns (he, she, we, me) the manuscript affords really no help. Either Milton frightened the poor man into the feeling that he ought to double the "e" as often as possible, or that was a personal peculiarity of his own, for he seems to prefer "hee," "mee," "wee," "yee"—and even "bee" for the verb. But he vacillates badly. Seventeen times he spells "hee," sixteen times "he." Twice he has "mee," once "me." (Namely, at l. 635, where the second edition prints "mee":

For mee be witness all the Host of Heav'n,  
If counsels different, or danger shun'd  
By me have lost our hopes. 1674)

Seven times the manuscript has used "wee," three times "we."

There are four examples of "bee," and one of "yee." Clearly there is no guidance here, and the printer of the first edition wisely ignored the variations and stuck to the usual form. The only change I feel sure of in the second edition is that cited above. Miss Darbishire somewhat fails to recognise how inadequate the guidance of the manuscript is and suggests that "hee" should be retained or supplied in some twelve pages. I find myself unable to agree with her regarding several of these, not because I deny that there is emphasis on the pronoun, but because the emphasis seems to me to be so distributed between the pronoun and its qualifying phrases that it disturbs the effect to concentrate the emphasis upon the pronoun. For example, I should not feel justified in giving a special emphasis to the pronoun in l. 142 "he our conqueror" because the stronger accent (rhetorical accent—these spellings have nothing to do with metrical accent) seems to me to rest on "conquerour"; nor again in ll. 637-8:

But he who reigns  
Monarch in heav'n

because again the heavier accent seems to me to fall on "monarch." On the other hand, I should be disposed, as Miss Darbishire apparently is not, to give the fullest possible emphasis to "he" in l. 589:

Thus farr these beyond  
Compare of mortall prowess, yet observ'd  
Thir dread Commander; hee above the rest  
In shape and gesture proudly eminent  
Stood like a towre.

I say this with no thought of criticising Miss Darbishire, whose ear is just as good as mine. But I wish to bring out the fact which Milton himself, perhaps, did not fully realise, that the problem of these pronouns is very different from that of "their." There are only two possible pronunciations of the latter: it is either an enclitic, leaning on the next word, or it is given a distinct emphasis, generally in an antithetical statement, express or implied: "Undoubtedly the mercy which they pretend is the mercy of wicked men; and their mercies we read are cruelties." But "wee," "hee," etc., are susceptible to so many shades of emphasis that it is impossible to indicate all of them by two different spellings. If I were attempting again to print Milton's poem as I believe he wished it to be read, I should accept the edition of 1674 as representing the nearest

approach to what he wished to secure. In one or two instances I might feel tempted to follow the device he adopts in Book XII, l. 152, and use capital letters.

Miss Darbishire has done a very useful piece of work with very great care. The book includes an Introduction discussing the history of the manuscript, Milton's spelling, and his punctuation. This is followed by a collotype reproduction of the manuscript, and this again by a reprint on opposite pages of the text of the manuscript and the text of the first edition. In these pages I have noted only one error—"opprobrious" at l. 402. This is followed by some notes and a special appendix on the history of Milton's spelling of "their." Might I say again in reference to this that I did not "profess" to base my case on that of the second edition. I cannot imagine any motive for professing to do what I did not. Miss Darbishire's work has cleared the way for any editor who, basing on the second edition, must nevertheless give careful consideration to all that had preceded it.

H. J. C. GRIERSON.

**Ichabod Dawks and his "News-Letter" with an Account of the Dawks Family of Booksellers and Stationers, 1635-1731.** By STANLEY MORISON. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1931. Pp. viii+43. 21s. net.

**The English Newspaper.** Some account of the physical development of Journals printed in London between 1622 & the present day. By STANLEY MORISON. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1932. Pp. xii+335. 45s. net.

In the first of these two books, Mr. Stanley Morison and the Cambridge Press between them have produced a very attractive volume on the text of the somewhat obscure family of stationers and printers of the name of Dawks. The first of these, Thomas Dawks I, after being apprenticed to a bookseller in 1635, eventually became Rector of St. Michael, Queenhithe, 1653-1662, and died in 1670. His son, Thomas Dawks II, was a printer who, besides being patentee for Welsh books, did a good deal of general business as a bookseller and publisher until about 1685, when he was succeeded by his son Ichabod. This Ichabod in 1696 started a bi-weekly journal entitled *The Protestant Mercury*, which continued for some four years, and



shortly after this a printed news-sheet *Dawks's News-Letter* in script type apparently cut for the purpose, which was the original cause of Mr. Morison's interest in him, through his discovery of the matrices of the type used for this letter. Mr. Morison has also found and made use of a manuscript, now in the British Museum, which was owned in succession by several members of the Dawks family, and on the fly-leaves of which they had recorded the family births, marriages and deaths with other miscellaneous notes, including some rather curious information as to the value placed by Dawks upon the rights and stock of certain books which he held.

The volume contains collotype facsimiles of some pages of these entries and of several news-letters, besides a type-facsimile of Ichabod's *News-Letter* of August 3, 1699, printed from type cast from the original matrices. *Dawks's News-Letter*, issued three times a week and consisting of three folio pages, the fourth being left blank, seems to have cost 10s. a quarter in 1696 and later 20s. a year (all paid in advance), or 30s. a year if only a quarter was paid in advance.

Mr. Morison prints an interesting petition of three type-founders by which it appears that in 1675 there was a shortage of type and of English journeymen able to cast it. They therefore pray for permission to employ foreigners in their service.

The second of the volumes consists, with certain amplifications, of the lectures delivered by Mr. Morison at Cambridge in February 1932 as Sandars Reader in Bibliography, and gives us a most valuable record of the development of the outward form of newspapers from 1622 to the present time. The book is illustrated by many excellent reproductions of complete pages of journals of various dates and of headings and other typographical items, including a most interesting collotype frontispiece in which ten front pages from papers dated from 1644 to 1829 are shown partially superimposed in order to illustrate the general development in size and style, from a type area of about  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$  inches to the present size of the *Times*. The appeal of Mr. Morison's work is of course mainly to the typographical expert, but there is much in it to interest the student of literature, and of manners, not only in the text but in the facsimiles of pages of the journals dealt with, for the author has evidently chosen his examples with care. It is, I think, to be regretted that he did not give us in tabular form a list of the very numerous journals with

which he deals, with the earliest and latest issues known to him and an indication of the libraries in which copies may be found. This would have meant a comparatively small addition to the very great amount of work which Mr. Morison must have done in tracing them and, for readers of *R.E.S.* at any rate, would have added greatly to the value of the book. There are few things about which it is more difficult to get accurate information, with the references necessary in order to check it, than early periodicals, and until some devoted scholar produces a full bibliography of them, every scrap of first-hand information from those who have actually studied them is of importance. But it is hardly fair when an author has carried out the task which he has set himself so excellently as Mr. Morison has done in this volume, to complain that he has not at the same time done something else. The volume is, as one would expect, remarkably well produced, and has one of the most attractive jackets that I have seen.

R. B. McK.

**The Works of Thomas Otway : Plays, Poems and Love-Letters.** Edited by J. C. GHOSH. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1932. 2 Vols. : Vol. I, pp. xii+520 ; Vol. II, pp. viii+542. 40s. net.

THE eight editions of Otway's Works that appeared from 1712 to 1812 bear witness both to the general popularity of the author and also to the prevalent uncritical attitude towards the printed word during that period. In 1813 Thomas Thornton presented a text, even more corrupt in many respects than those preceding, that was to remain the standard until the recent revival of interest in Restoration drama. In 1926 the Nonesuch Press published the *Complete Works* in three sumptuous volumes edited by the Rev. Montague Summers. The fact that this was a limited edition may in part explain the need for the present work ; a brief comparison between the two, however, will leave no doubt in the reader's mind that Mr. Ghosh was amply justified on other grounds. In particular he offers detailed evidence to confute the claim that the former text was " in every case exactly given from the original editions."

The present text has been prepared with scrupulous regard for the highest standards of modern scholarship. Only in very rare

instances have the readings of the original quartos been altered, and these have all been noted at the foot of the text, where also other variants in later editions are given. The explanation of the rules governing the minuter alterations and corrections in the use of punctuation, italic and roman type, brackets and in the mode of setting out lines indicates the thoroughness with which the work has been done. Such changes have been made only when the original printer's normal usage justifies the supposition of misprinting. For example, a nice distinction is made between the printer's indiscriminate use of the apostrophe in such contracted forms as *'sdeath*, *s'death*, or *ne're*, *ne'er*, *ner'e*, *ne'r*, *ner* (*never*); and his regular use of roman "s" when separated by an apostrophe from a proper name in italic. The former usage has been retained, while exceptions to the latter have been rectified silently. To the list of "Silent Corrections and Alterations" should have been added the omission of all catch-words. A few pages of additional textual notes are printed before some fifty pages of explanatory notes at the end of the second volume.

In a clearly planned Introduction of ninety-four pages are set out an account of Otway's life, a brief discussion of his works, a bibliographical description of the various editions, and an explanation, historical and descriptive, of the text that follows. The biographical material is handled with ease and with economy; in some matters, indeed, fuller documentation and discussion might with advantage have been given. Whilst the priority of Professor Ham's work, as it originally appeared in *Notes and Queries* (1925 and 1926), is duly acknowledged, it seems that Mr. Ghosh's researches were carried out for the most part independently and before the publication of *Otway and Lee* last year.<sup>1</sup> In general it may be said that his findings confirm, sometimes from different sources, those of Mr. Ham, and he has also been able to throw fresh light on certain questions such as those concerning Otway's ancestry and family, his residence at Winchester and Oxford, his Cambridge degree, and his military service. On this last point it is shown that the date of Otway's commission as ensign in the Duke of Monmouth's regiment of foot was February 10, 1678, or 1677, Old Style. The discovery, which is recorded without comment, is of interest, for it confirms the accuracy of Anthony à Wood, who had previously been held to be in error for giving the year as 1677, against the

<sup>1</sup> See Review, *R. E. S.*, viii, p. 484, Oct. 1932.

authority of Dalton's *Army Lists* where the date is given as May 1, 1678. The earlier date lends colour to the view that Otway joined the army in consequence of the break with his patron Rochester late in 1677. Mr. Ham had suggested that the occasion was the birth in December of a child to that nobleman by Mrs. Barry. Mr. Ghosh does not refer to this incident, nor to Otway's jealousy, though he accepts the story of the poet's infatuation for the actress as told in the six Love-letters. To this, the most fascinating problem of Otway's biography, only two paragraphs are given, while on the relatively unimportant question of the precise manner of his death there are three pages.

In summing up Mr. Ham's main argument in support of the authenticity of the Letters, Mr. Ghosh repeats the statement made by more than one writer recently that in 1713 their original publishers named Mrs. Barry as the recipient. This is not strictly correct, for they first appeared with Rochester's *Familiar Letters*, 1697, "printed by W. Onley for Sam. Briscoe"; Otway is named as the author on the title-page and in the Dedication signed by Tom Brown. In the second edition, of the same year, the words "and are to be sold by R. Wellington at the Lute in St. Paul's Church-yard" are added on the Title-page; and Mrs. Barry's name, as the recipient, first occurs in an advertisement, appended to Nathaniel Lee's *Works*, 1713 (Vol. I, pp. 509, 510), of "Books Printed for R. Wellington at the Dolphin and Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard. 1712." The date 1712 is worth noting, as it seems to dispose of the suggestion put forward, not however by Mr. Ghosh, that the publishers refrained from disclosing Mrs. Barry's name until her death, in 1713. Of the works just cited only the first, the 1697 edition of the Letters, is mentioned in Mr. Ghosh's Bibliography.

Misprints in these excellently produced volumes are extremely rare: in those parts of the text itself that have been tested by the present reviewer none has been found; in the Introduction, p. 7, the year given as 1679, when Otway was seventeen, should be 1669; p. 8, last line of note 4, "May 23: 68" should surely be "May 23: 69"; p. 51, eight lines from bottom, "that" should be "than."

D. M. WALMSLEY.

**Jane Austen's Letters to her Sister Cassandra and Others.**

Collected and edited by R. W. CHAPMAN. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1932. Two volumes: Vol. I, pp. xlvii + 266 and Notes on Letters 1-68; Vol. II, pp. xxx + 267-509 and Notes on Letters 69-148 and Indexes. 2 vols. 42s. net.; 1 vol. 63s. net.

JANE AUSTEN's letters have crept sedately under the public eye, as did all her work. So great has been the discretion of herself and her family biographers that much of the correspondence, and probably the more desirable part, has vanished off the scene. Her nephew Austen-Leigh, her great-nephew Lord Brabourne, the compilers of the *Life* and others who have drawn on the stores of these and of the nieces, especially Caroline Austen and Anna Lefroy, have granted the world snippets or selections from the family budgets she was writing continually. Now Dr. Chapman has swept together the whole of the extant letters, or their authenticated texts, after ten years confessedly spent on their collection and contemplation, and issues it through the Oxford Press in two well-devised and printed volumes, with notes, maps and illustrations from contemporary sources, exhaustive and entrancing indexes; with every aid to the student, the artist in historical background, or the lovers of the very Jane. These lovers will thank him, and it is probable, for the sake of the delighted few, Dr. Chapman will forgive a few others who smile at the "solemn absurdity" of his monument. Family, or duty-letters, the majority to Cassandra may be called, covering twenty years, the latter half of her short life, rarely confidential, since (as the editor points out) they were seldom intended for a single eye, chit-chat of house and neighbourhood, wherever the writer might be; detailed in a distracting degree, but slovenly or insipid, never. Some of these pages would read like exercises, but for the sweet spirit beneath, "playfulness," to use her own word of *Pride and Prejudice*, by which details about caps, or the correct dispersal of carriages, are illumined just as in her books. Comment on the novels, her secret hoard, grows more free as the books are published, after 1811, but there is little beyond what the nephews have already made known. Of public affairs there is rarely a mention (from 1796 to 1817), and then only the remarks of an astute provincial lady. For the student of manners, the letters are a storehouse of engaging detail, and the language, though probably individual, of great interest.

Very fragile stuff, but the editor has rendered the writer's fame a last gentle service in securing it absolutely for the generations to judge. The worst that can be said of the series is that at the end we still reach out to the real confidence denied us—but perhaps, even in the lost letters to Henry Austen, it was never written at all. The letter to Martha Lloyd (addendum) represents the fresh material acquired, and throughout the gaps in the text are filled in, the portrait filled out. "Playfulness" is not a quality to be confined to dapper extracts, it needs space to gleam. Jane was an embroideress, we hear, and it is enlightening as to her style, unquotable. For who would cut "satin-stitch"? If some, even of the lovers, lay down the book, irritated by quips levelled at the unknown, family secrets the clue to which is long lost, ghostly gaiety, there will be others whom this wonderfully sage playfulness never tires. Dr. Chapman's own appreciation, nicely veiled as Austen would have veiled it, enters the mind reading, "and being help't, inhabits there." But is it not carrying coyness to excess to give them only one portrait of the heroine, and that one turned away?

ETHEL SIDGWICK.

**Introductions to Jane Austen.** By JOHN BAILEY. London: H. Milford. 1931. 8 in. Pp. vii+147. 6s. net.

SHORT as this book is, it is long enough to make us realise more than ever what a fine critic we lost in John Bailey. How lucky it was that before his death he took the trouble to bring together the introductions he had written to the Georgian edition of Jane Austen's novels, and by prefixing a chapter on her life as presented in her letters, to leave behind him a terse but adequate study of herself and her work. Read separately, the introductions were all that could be desired; each contained exactly the right amount of critical comparison with the novels that came before or after. Undoubtedly, the proper way to study Jane Austen is to observe how and if possible why she attains various degrees of success with characters that are more or less similar to each other and situations which are more or less parallel. The general range of her character-drawing and the variety of motives and main situations are not too considerable for us to say that she is always playing the same game with the same pack of cards. She deals herself different hands; she has to vary her



play according to circumstances ; but she adopts the same strategy every time. The differences between the various rubbers are about as many as would be expected in the old-fashioned game of whist rather than in the more fertile combinations of bridge. John Bailey had all these differences in mind when he wrote his successive introductions, and they come out in a most effective and illuminating fashion when these are read in their proper sequence as a series of chapters.

Mr. Palmer, in *Sense and Sensibility*, is "a rude beginning" of Mr. Bennet, "but the first chapter of *Pride and Prejudice* at once sets the latter miles beyond his predecessor. On the other hand, Willoughby is certainly a more plausible scoundrel than Wickham, whose often alleged charms have to be taken wholly on trust. But neither is very successful." Later on, Henry Crawford comes into comparison with the two earlier scamps, and the author doubts whether "it is possible to believe in him, or in Mary," his sister. Would such a mere worldling ever have been drawn to such a homely though sterling personality as Fanny, the heroine of *Mansfield Park*? "Henry and Mary stand or fall by the answer which we give, when we lay the book down, to the question whether we can believe in them, whether we see in them whole human beings, speaking and acting as, in the circumstances, such people would have acted and spoken." Bailey regards Mary Bennet in *Pride and Prejudice* as Jane Austen's "one absolute failure." We can agree that she is dull and lifeless ; but if we also agree that "Jane's uncertainty about the Crawfords, in *Mansfield Park*," leads to "the worst inconsistency about any important character in all her novels," are we not admitting a much more serious failure? Mary Bennet is a character of quite minor importance ; the whole course of events in the other novel hinges for a long while on Jane Austen's reading of the two Crawfords. But we shall probably endorse the general remark that "Jane Austen did not understand scoundrels, and they never come alive in her hands." The Fairfax and Churchill business, in *Emma*, supplies a further relevant comparison.

John Bailey is very good also on the moralistic conversations that are such a common feature in Jane Austen's novels. All the characters she means us to admire "continually discuss questions of character and ethics. That is partly the eighteenth-century and Johnsonian habit of talking about morals." But the novel always has busied itself, and probably always will, with ethical problems,

even if, as usually now, the subject is not overtly mentioned. George Eliot and Nathaniel Hawthorne were even more moralistic, though in totally different ways; and what about George Meredith, or for that matter Arnold Bennett or Mr. Galsworthy? The distinctive point about Jane Austen is simply that she put so much of it into the drawing-room conversations. "Jane admired goodness as much as she was amused by folly. The two between them make up her books." That is well said, and with the passages already culled may be taken as an example of the pure and unaffected but pithy style of the book; though we do not like to read, on p. 47, that "Lady Catharine *demeans* herself to forbid Elizabeth to accept Darcy."

E. A. BAKER.

**Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.** Including Certain Letters Republished from Original Sources. Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. In two volumes. London: Constable & Co., Ltd. 1932. Vol. I, pp. xxiv+460; Vol. II, pp. iv+476. 37s. 6d. net.

THE title of Professor Griggs's volumes is exactly descriptive. Of the 400 letters included more than 250 have never before been published, even in part, and of the rest eighty have hitherto been printed only in extracts, often of but a few lines. Of the letters republished many (notably those which passed through the hands of Cottle and Brandl) have been inaccurately printed, and the others are scattered through volumes many of which are out of print or privately printed, and through the files of periodicals.

The letters, whether unpublished or previously published, "are taken," to quote Professor Griggs, "from the original letters or from transcripts made by Ernest Hartley Coleridge" (I, xii). The use of the transcripts referred to is the unavoidable consequence of the loss by E. H. Coleridge of his grandfather's holograph letters. Happily copies of most of them had previously been made by him, and it is from these transcripts that 149 of the 400 letters are published. It should, however, be added that thirteen letters (Letters 41, 121, 148, 149, 171, 188, 199, 207, 261, 303, 304, 334, 396) are printed from transcripts made by others than Ernest Hartley Coleridge; that five (Letters 337-340, 388) are taken from facsimiles;

and three (Letters 38, 341, 345) from printed sources. Since these exceptions have been admitted, it is a pity that the two extraordinarily interesting (and important) letters to Mrs. Coleridge from Germany, buried since 1835 in the *New Monthly Magazine* and (except for scholars) since 1907 in Herrig's *Archiv*, vol. cxviii—documents which notably supplement Letter 61—were not also included. Transcripts of them are in one of Tom Poole's copying-books, now in the possession of the Rev. G. H. B. Coleridge, and their reliability—I use the word which Coleridge coined (ii, 3, 204)—is certainly not less than that of the transcripts mentioned above. The essential point, however, is that with the exceptions named the letters in the collection are taken directly either from holographs or from transcripts made by Ernest Hartley Coleridge.

The proportion of unpublished to published material may be briefly exemplified through the letters to half a dozen correspondents. The most important groups of letters in the volumes are probably those addressed to three members of Coleridge's own family, and to Southey, Tom Poole, the Morgans, and William Sotheby. There are twenty-five letters to Mrs. Coleridge, of which but two have been published entire, and three in part. Of the ten letters to Derwent Coleridge (to Hartley Coleridge there are none), but one has been previously published, and of the twenty-three to George Coleridge, only three, and those but in part. Of the fifty-eight letters, in other words, to the three members of Coleridge's family with whom his relations were closest—his wife, his elder brother, and his younger son—forty-nine are entirely new. Moreover, of the twenty-six letters to Southey but one and parts of five have been previously published; of the twenty-six to Poole, but two and parts of fourteen; and of the twenty-two to the Morgans and the seventeen to Sotheby, in each case but one and parts of two. The value of the fresh light thrown by these volumes upon Coleridge's immediate personal relations alone can scarcely be overstated.

Moreover, *Unpublished Letters* and E. H. Coleridge's *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* stand in such relation that each enhances the other's value. In the earlier collection the letters chosen are chiefly those which in varying degrees reflect Coleridge's literary interests and activities. In the later collection the choice was of necessity restricted in large degree to letters of a more intimate and personal nature, drawn chiefly from the copious correspondence of the tragic later years. It is significant that E. H. Coleridge devotes

to the years after 1800 but 431 pages; Professor Griggs, 751. As a result the impact of the new volumes is overwhelmingly personal. The two collections supplement each other, and only by reading them together may a balanced judgment be reached of the great and pitiful figure who moves, like archangel ruined, through these later pages.

Only the barest hints of the wealth of the new material are possible here. Of the first importance are the amazing letters (especially Nos. 92, 102-105, 110, with which should be read Nos. 101 and 164) that reveal Coleridge's honest and unbelievably tactless efforts—no mortal could have meant better and done worse—to reach some ground of mutual understanding with his wife. Letters 104, 135, 143, 150, and especially 229 and 283 (together with the new light thrown upon his life-insurance in Letters 114, 119, 150, 256, 284, 290, and 360) establish once for all Coleridge's continued contribution to the support of his wife and children—a contribution the more significant in view of the deplorable meagreness (of which there is in these letters ample evidence) of his income from his writings. The letter of 1795 (Letter 18) to George Dyer, virtually inaccessible till now, gives Coleridge's version, set down at the time, of his chivalrous motives in marrying Sara Fricker; with which may be read, as a pendant, the half dozen scathing lines of 1814 (ii, 122) into which is concentrated his later detestation of the Frickers. Much of what he wrote with relish of his undeniable ill-health (how much only those who know the later letters can even guess) Professor Griggs has wisely excised. But enough remains to enhance the irony of Coleridge's reference to his "strange tyrannous Reluctance to make any painful concern of [his] own the subject of discourse" (i, 432; see also i, 398). The additions to the long list of those unfulfilled plans which (in his own pet phrase) "vegetated like Surinam toads," offer fresh evidence of his perpetual self-deception. And nothing in these volumes gives sadder proof of the continued cause of his enfeebled will than the group of letters (Nos. 337-342, 388; see also Nos. 389-390) which establish his surreptitious purchases of opium while he was with the Gillmans, even as late as 1832. Poverty and opium and ill-health—with an unhappy marriage—stand out as never before as the arbiters of Coleridge's destiny.

"Glorious islets" still rise out of the haze. The brilliant analysis of Wordsworth's genius in the first paragraph of Letter 121;

the criticism in Letter 214 (with a phrase or two worthy of Byron) of *The Lady of the Lake* and Scott; the discussion of plagiarism, apropos of *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* and *Christabel*, in Letter 222; the critique (with its lovely description of the dawn) of Anton Wall's *Amatonda*, in Letter 216; the statement (never bettered) in Letter 336 of the relation between Science and the Bible; among the letters to Lord Byron (Nos. 256, 259, 260, 264, 266) especially Letter 260, with its account of *Christabel*—it is emergences such as these of Coleridge's critical faculties from the damp which fell round his path that constitute perhaps the most priceless contribution of these volumes.

The editorial apparatus of the edition is admirable. The headnotes are models of compact statement of essential facts; the footnotes are unobtrusive; and the page is a pleasure to the eye. A fuller index of names and subjects would add greatly to the working value of the collection. Further printings will almost certainly be called for, and the errata which follow have that probability in mind. The errors of transcription, in the letters which could be checked, are for the most part relatively trivial, but they do impair the meticulous exactness aimed at.

A collation of those letters (Nos. 17, 20, 21, 25, 270, 304, 305) of which the originals were immediately accessible in the Harvard College Library reveals (especially in the case of Letter 304) a number of inaccuracies. A few minor slips in punctuation have not been taken into account. In Letter 17, p. 27, "Poemata," not "[Poemata]", is correct; p. 28, l. 13, "the Path" should be "her Path"; in Letter 20, l. 3, for "There" read "there," and delete the full-stop after "sent"—i.e. read: "in addition to these now sent there are," etc.; in Letters 20 and 21, "Burnett" should be (as Coleridge wrote it) "Burnet"; in Letter 25, a clause of the greatest interest scrawled at the top of the page is omitted: "at your own house in the Barton, or at the Shop-house this Evening?"<sup>1</sup>; in Letter 305, p. 255, l. 7 from foot, "intestine" is underlined by Coleridge. Professor Griggs states (I, xiv) that "the capital letters are printed as Coleridge used them." Excluding Letter 304, there are, in the six other letters in question, more than a dozen instances in which either capitals are reduced to lower case, or lower case

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to Bertram R. Davis, Esq., of Bristol, for verifying the reading "in the Barton," and for deciphering the second "house." "St. James's Barton" appears in at least one eighteenth-century plan of Bristol simply as "Barton," and the district is still constantly referred to in Bristol as "the Barton."

letters raised to capitals. In Letter 304 (which was not transcribed by Professor Griggs himself) there are eighteen instances of reduced capitals; and in the same letter "worried . . . with" (p. 254) should be "worried . . . into"; "*monthly* fair" should be "*morally* fair"; italics are omitted in two instances and the punctuation is inaccurately represented. It should be added that Letter 270 is printed, not from the holograph (accessible since 1924 in the Harvard College Library), but from E. H. Coleridge's transcript. Have others, perhaps, of the lost originals survived? Finally, the fact that in the Harvard collection alone—to name it merely *exempli gratia*—there are many letters of equal (or more than equal) interest with those which have been printed from it strengthens the hope that the promised complete edition may not be delayed.

The following notes are concerned with letters which could not be collated with the holographs. In I, 166, no emendation of "griet [greet?]" is necessary: "To griet in the Cambrian dialect, signifying to roar aloud," etc. (*Letters*, ed. E. H. Coleridge, I, 339); I, 245 (near foot), for "Drawean [?]" read "Drawcansir"; I, 418, l. 12, for "of" read "or"; in II, 44, l. 11, the full-stop (which destroys the sense) should be the comma or small dash, which for Coleridge often performed the office of a colon; II, 94, "much [?]" needs no query, only a capital. "Much, the miller's son," or "lytell Much," was one of Robin Hood's chief comrades. In II, 163 (headnote), for "Ten days" read "Fifteen days," since Byron left England, April 25 (*Letters*, ed. Prothero, III, 285; *Hobhouse, Recollections*, etc., I, 335); II, 174, for "Surcuhusius [?]" read "Surenhusius" (*Mischna sive Totius Hebræorum Juris, Rituum, Antiquitatum . . . Illustravit Guilielmus Surenhusius*, Amsterdam, 1698-1703); II, 194, for "Hursts [?]" read "Hunts" (*Anti-Cobbett*, 1817, *passim*; *Cobbett's Register*, 1816-1817, *passim*; etc.); II, 195, "Washburn [?]" : a Washburn at this juncture is to seek; Coleridge's description fits perfectly Alderman Waithman, who does belong in this galley, and "Waithman" in Coleridge's hand might well resemble "Washburn"; II, 199, "in lieu Groves" is meaningless; Brandl (who deals freely with the letter) reads "in the Caen Wood," which at least fits the context. The holograph should be re-read. In II, 200, for Invill [?] read "Lovell," and for "Phantasius" read "Phantasien"—or possibly, if Brandl's reading of the holograph is correct, "Phantasies." In any case



the reference is to Wackenroder's *Phantasien über die Kunst . . . Herausgegeben von L. Tieck*—as Coleridge accurately states. Tieck's *Phantasia* (which Professor Griggs in his note assumes Coleridge to have confused with *Phantasien*, and of which Tieck was editor, not author) is an entirely different work. The fact that "the fiction . . . recorded by *Bramante*" (II, 200) occurs on p. 8 of *Phantasien* would settle the matter, were other evidence needed. In II, 257, for "Carmoyante" read "larmoyante"; II, 357, for "Crohis [?]" a re-reading of the manuscript, one may guess, will give "Critici." *Critici Sacri, sive Doctissimorum Virorum in Biblia Annotationes*, 1660, was the regular companion to Poole. "Pole" in the same line is correct, since Coleridge has Matthæus Polus of the title-page in mind. In II, 396, for at least part of "[. . . ? . . .] Gedden," the theme of Irving's sermons in 1827 suggests "Armageddon"—"his Jews" referring back to Irving by way of Hatley Frere. In II, 399, "[sic]" should be deleted after "Aristophanics," which is elsewhere (II, 172, 284) properly printed without it. The correctness of Coleridge's use of the term is clear from his references to the translations as *Imitations* (II, 171, 243, 285) or *Parabases* (II, 167, 171).

The very important Letter 61 raises several questions. On p. 115, in the phrase "the Monarch Ruin of the Hesse," Hesse is certainly wrong, and Plesse (as printed in the *New Monthly Magazine* and Herrig's *Archiv*) is certainly right. The great ruin of the Plesse, on its "high, woody Hill," is still the goal of a favourite excursion from Göttingen; Hesse in this context is impossible.<sup>1</sup> I have not seen the original letter for several years, but there is other evidence in Coleridge's own hand. On the day upon which he left Göttingen (Midsummer Day, 1799) he wrote in pencil on the back of his farewell letter from the younger Blumenbach (see, for its later history, *The Road to Xanadu*, new edition, pp. 604q-604r) notes of the very same landscape which he had described five weeks before in this letter to Poole (even to the "complete Bower . . . clothed with Beeches as with Grasses"), and he drew a rough sketch of the hill on which the Plesse stands. And in these notes "Plesse" is unmistakable. On p. 111, l. 5 from foot, the change from "curiosity" to "University" is obviously wrong. There

<sup>1</sup> On Hessen-Dreisch, in the first letter to Sara Coleridge, see Vollmer's note in *Archiv*, cxviii, 2, n. 1. The Plesse is both depicted and described in *Der Göttinger Student*, Göttingen, 1813, pp. 65-68, and, with its cornfields, in a recent handbook, *Göttingen als Pensionopolis*, Goslar, n.d., pp. 35-36.

was no University at Goslar, and "curiosity" refers to "the Dome Church"—a characterisation which the description which follows amply warrants. "Bare and strong" (p. 115, l. 8) for "bare and stony" is dubious, as are two or three other readings. "Half Lutheran" (p. 112, l. 3 from foot) for "half heathen" (as in the *New Monthly Magazine and Archiv*), in view of Carlyon's remark (*Early Years and Late Reflections*, I, 115) that the church was "at the service of the Lutherans on Sundays, and of the Roman Catholics on all other days," is probably correct. But before a second printing the letter should be re-read with the holograph.<sup>1</sup>

The importance of the documents which Professor Griggs has collected warrants these contributions towards their impeccability.

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES.

### SHORT NOTICE

**Mary Wollstonecraft: A Sketch.** By H. R. JAMES. London: H. Milford. 1932. Pp. xvi+180. 7s. 6d. net.

The author, sometime Principal of Presidency College, Calcutta, died on June 2, 1931. He had completed this sympathetic sketch of Mary Wollstonecraft in 1928 when the Franchise Act conferred the vote on more than four millions of British women. That it was not published at the time was partly due to the writer's thoughts being occupied with a new question, that of Dominion Status for India. But thanks to the generosity of an old Christ Church friend and pupil, this little work now sees the light in the form in which it left its author's hands.

It was written in the spirit of admiration and sympathy by one who, as will be seen from the Preface and from Appendix B, had digested the now extensive literature which has accumulated about Mary Wollstonecraft since her death. It offers no new discoveries, but it cannot fail to interest many who have not read the longer books. Whatever their views on female suffrage, they will not lay it down without having caught some of Dr. James's admiration for the remarkable woman who was the pioneer of the movement.

G. C. M. S.

<sup>1</sup> In one important matter Professor Griggs (I, 342, n. 3) has allowed William Knight to lead him astray. The evidence is conclusive that the undated letter from Wordsworth to Sir George Beaumont about Coleridge's recoil from the thought of domesticating with his wife (*Memorials of Coleridge*, II, 123), was written in 1806 and not in 1811. Its remark about "your ancestor's verses" (p. 121) is a direct reference (as the contexts make clear) to "your ancestor's poems" in the dated letter of August 21, 1806 (*Memorials*, I, 160), and that in turn refers to "Sir John Beaumont's poems" in the letter of August 5, 1806 (*ibid.* I, 154). Sir George's "picture of the Thorn," which (the letter states) "has been ten days under our roof" (*Memorials*, II, 121), had been exhibited in the Royal Academy in 1806. Mary Lamb, in a letter of August 29, 1806 (*Works*, ed. Lucas, VI, 359), sends her advice to Wordsworth to do precisely what (in the undated letter) he declares he is about to do. In 1811 it was not true that Coleridge, who was living with the Morgans, had "no plan for his own residence" (*Memorials*, II, 123); in 1806 it was. And in 1811 the bitter breach between Wordsworth and Coleridge was still unhealed (see *Unpublished Letters*, II, 48, 51, 58, 79, etc.), and the undated letter could not have been written then.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ANGLIA, Vol. LVII. (Neue Folge XLV.), January 1933—

Die Entwicklung der englisch-schottischen Volksballaden I (W. Schmidt), pp. 1-77.

Substantivsätze mit oder ohne *that* in der neueren englischen Literatur (Joh. Ellinger), pp. 78-109.

Nochmals *ae. orc* (J. Hoops), pp. 110-11.

*Ae. orc* (W. Krogmann), p. 112.

BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. VII., October 1932—

Sir Walter Scott and Douce (O. E. H.), pp. 99-102.

— January 1933—

Izaak Walton's Copy of Pembroke and Ruddier's Poems (John Butt), p. 140.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 17, January 1933—

A Midsummer Night's Dream (H. B. Charlton), pp. 46-66.

Hand-list of Charters, Deeds, and Similar Documents in the Possession of the John Rylands Library, 2 (1): Documents acquired from Various Sources (Moses Tyson), pp. 130-77.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, December 1932—

Boswell as Artist (Hesketh Pearson), pp. 704-11.

Miss Seward's account of the "tremendous conversation at Dilly's" April 15, 1778.

Anthony Trollope and *The Cornhill* (Leonard Huxley), pp. 758-66.

— January 1933—

On a Sheet of Thackeray Manuscript (J. E. Wells), pp. 34-44.

*The Notch on the Axe.*

DIALECT NOTES, Vol. VI., Part V., December 1932—

An American Glossary (R. H. Thornton), pp. 287-312.

Part III, Front office—Half horse and half alligator.

## ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 67, November 1932—

*Beowulf* (W. Krogmann), pp. 161-64.Names in *-ulf*.

Zur Frage der Verfasserschaft einiger mittellenglischer Stabreimdichtungen (H. Koziol), pp. 165-73.

An Oriental Theme in *Sir Ysumbras* (A. H. Krappe), pp. 174-77.

British Criticism of Defoe as a Novelist, 1719-1860 (C. E. Burch), pp. 178-98.

Crabb Robinson and Goethe in England (B. J. Morse), pp. 199-227.

Der Gedankengehalt von Baileys *Festus* (E. Goldschmidt), pp. 228-37.

Der Sündenesser (Hans Hecht), pp. 238-46.

## ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XIV., December 1932—

Spenserian Echoes in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (A. G. van Kranendonk), pp. 209-17.The Background of Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* (B. J. Timmer and J. L. Cardozo), pp. 217-19.

Reply to J. L. Cardozo's article (pp. 177-86), and rejoinder.

## JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXI., October 1932—

The Terminate Aspect of the Expanded Form : its Development and its Relation to the Gerund (C. R. Goedsche), pp. 469-77.

A Note on Compounds in *Beowulf* (J. R. Hulbert), pp. 504-08.

The Wrath of King Lear (J. W. Ashton), pp. 530-36.

## — Vol. XXXII., January 1933—

The Chinese Origin of a Romanticism (Arthur O. Lovejoy), pp. 1-20.  
Chinese gardening.The Influence of the Court Tragedy on the Play Scene in *Hamlet* (R. de S. Childs), pp. 44-50.*Moll Flanders* in Germany (T. M. Hatfield), pp. 51-65.

An Unpublished MS. of Charles Montague, Earl of Halifax (1661-1715), pp. 66-69.

Rough drafts of poems, published and unpublished.

A Note on *Faust and Faustus* (M. Blakemore Evans), pp. 81-82.

Goethe's knowledge of Marlowe's tragedy.

## LIBRARY, Vol. XIII., December 1932—

The Aims of Bibliography (Stephen Gaselee), pp. 225-50.

Notes by W. W. Greg and A. W. Pollard, pp. 250-58.

Notes on Errata from Books in the Chapin Library (Lucy E. Osborne), pp. 259-71.

*If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*, and *The Famous Historie of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (Mary F. Martin), pp. 272-81.Authorship and relation to *Lady Jane*.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 251

Smollett's Works as Printed by William Strahan, with an Unpublished Letter of Smollett to Strahan (L. M. Knapp), pp. 282-91.

Travel and Topography in Seventeenth Century England (G. E. Fussell and V. G. B. Atwater), pp. 292-311.

Bibliographical.

Translations for the Elizabethan Middle Class (L. B. Wright), pp. 312-31.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XXVII., December 1932—

Anthony Trollope (H. Belloc), pp. 150-57.

— February 1933—

The Boswell Supplement (H. N. Kirwan), pp. 331-40.

Boswell's manuscripts and their history.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. I., December 1932—

A romance of *Gaheret* (E. Vinaver), pp. 157-67.

The English tail-rhyme romances (continued) (A. McI. Trounce), pp. 168-82.

*Sigetwara land* (J. R. R. Tolkien), pp. 183-96.

*Exodus*, 69-71.

Middle English *alod*, *olod* (C. T. Onions), pp. 206-08.

Old English *hrohian* (N. R. Ker), p. 208.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLVIII., January 1933—

The Butler-Oxenden Correspondence (R. Quintana), pp. 1-11.

Thackeray and Friedrich von Heyden (W. Kurrelmeyer), pp. 12-16.

Parallels to *Miss Shum's Husband*.

Browning's *The Ring and the Book* and Wassermann's *Der Fall Maurizius* (F. Schneider), pp. 16-17.

Two Unpublished Notes by S. T. Coleridge (W. E. Gibbs), pp. 22-23.

In Cowley's *Preface to the Miscellanies* and in Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*.

Cardinal Newman's Literary Preferences (J. C. Thirlwall), pp. 23-27.

Unpublished letter to Thomas Arnold, 1856.

The Neck of Chaucer's Friar (Oze E. Horton), pp. 31-34.

Significance of a white neck in medieval physiognomy.

Chaucer's Prioress Again: An Interpretive Note (B. B. Wainwright), pp. 34-37.

Chaucerian-American "I Guess" (Stuart Robertson), pp. 37-40.

— February—

Monday as a Date for Tournaments, II. In England (S. Painter), pp. 82-83.

An *Interludium* for a Gild of Corpus Christi (K. Young), pp. 84-86.

Statement in the Return of the Bury St. Edmund's Gild, 1389.

*She Stoops to Conquer*: A Parallel (Mark Schorer), pp. 91-94.

Mrs. Centlivre's *The Man's Bewitched*.

An Example of Early Sentimentalism (J. M. Edmunds), pp. 94-97.  
*The Spanish Wives*, by Mary Griffith Pix, 1696.

Thomas Drue's *Dutches of Suffolke* and the Succession (J. K. Neill),  
 pp. 97-99.

James Hill, Player (R. B. Sharpe), pp. 99-101.  
 Reference in Swedish document of 1600.

Isis' Ass and the Elizabethans (G. R. Potter), p. 101.  
 Reference in Daniel's *Musophilus*.

*Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, and the *Ur-Hamlet* (F. T. Bowers),  
 pp. 101-08.

Shakespeare and Bacon as Horticultural Prophets (F. C. Bradford),  
 pp. 108-10.  
*Winter's Tale*, iv, iii. 81-85.

A Note on *Pericles* (Carroll Camden, Jr.), pp. 110-11.  
 i. i. 10-11.

#### MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXVIII., January 1933—

Fulk Greville, First Lord Brooke (G. Bullough), pp. 1-20.

Shakespeare's Imitators in the Eighteenth Century (J. R. Sutherland),  
 pp. 21-36.

Notes on the Text of the *Exeter Book* (W. S. Mackie), pp. 75-78.

Printed Books with Gabriel Harvey's Autograph or MS. Notes  
 (G. C. Moore Smith), pp. 78-81.  
 Supplementary list.

A Postscript to "Shorthand and the Bad Shakespeare Quartos"  
 (W. Matthews), pp. 81-83.  
*Bales' Brachygraphy*.

S. T. Coleridge's *The Knight's Tomb* and *Youth and Age* (Warren E.  
 Gibbs), pp. 83-85.  
 Variants from Coleridge's note-books.

#### MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXX., November 1932—

Changing Ideals of Aristocratic Character and Conduct in Seventeenth  
 Century England (W. Lee Ustick), pp. 147-66.

Joseph Glanvill, Witchcraft, and Seventeenth-Century Science  
 (Moody E. Prior), pp. 167-93.

An Introductory Bibliography for the Study of Proverbs (Archer  
 Taylor), pp. 195-210.

Swinburne on Coleridge (E. L. Griggs), pp. 215-16.  
 Letter to E. H. Coleridge.

#### NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. XVIII., January 1933—

George Gissing's Life from his Letters (W. van Maanen), pp. 115-30.

A Letter from Sir Walter Scott to James Ballantyne (A. E. H. Swaen),  
 pp. 130-31.  
 In the Royal Library at the Hague.



# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 163, November 5, 1932—

Two New Letters of John Keats (J. H. Birss), pp. 326-27.

To C. Cowden Clarke—the earliest extant—and to George Keats, November 1819.

— November 12—

*The London 'Prentice* (P. J. Crean), pp. 346-47.

Plays by Kitty Clive.

Poe: a Borrowing from Goldsmith (Jeannie B. Dixon), p. 350.

*The Assignation.*

— November 19—

An Obscure Letter of Lord Byron (Olybrius), pp. 367-68.

To the printer, with additional lines for *Thoughts suggested by a College Examination.*

Sir Walter Scott: a Farewell Letter (F. W. Cock), p. 368.

To Miss Elizabeth Scott.

Milton's Asclepiadean Verses (V. R.), p. 371.

— November 26—

The Politics of Milton's Apostate Angels (G. W. Whiting), pp. 384-86.

Debate of 1763-1764.

— December 3—

A Volume from Swift's Library (J. H. Birss), p. 404.

*Poems by Mrs. Anne Killigrew*, 1686.

— December 10—

*Paradise Lost*: a Book a Year? (C. W. Brodribb), pp. 417-18.

— December 24—

Swift and the English and Irish Theatre (C. M. Webster), pp. 452-54.

— Vol. 164, January 7, 1933—

Some University of Texas Copies of *Robinson Crusoe* (Edward G.

Fletcher), pp. 4-5.

Bibliographical details.

The Death of Catherine in *The Monastery* (Coleman Parsons),

pp. 5-6.

Origin of incident.

— January 14—

Defoe, Robin and Crusoe (J. R. Moore), p. 26.

Origin of names.

— January 21—

"Plat" (F. H. Cheetham), pp. 38-39.

Varying uses of word.

Smollett's Influence on *The Rivals* (Coleman O. Parsons), pp. 39-41.

## NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 164, January 28, 1933—

Footlights (P. J. Crean), pp. 61-62.

Introduction at Drury Lane and Covent Garden in 1765-1766.

## PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XI., October 1932—

Goethe's Shakespeare (F. B. Wahr), pp. 344-58.

Notes on *King Lear* (Alfred Kelcy), pp. 359-73.The Case of Forman's *Booke of Plaies* (David Klein), pp. 385-95.

Possibility of forgery by Collier.

*Intimations of Immortality* Again (John D. Rea), pp. 396-400.A Note on *Othello* (H. F. Watson), pp. 400-02.

Parallel between Michael Cassio and Michael Drayton.

A Note on Sonnet II of *Astrophel and Stella* (J. M. Purcell), pp. 402-03.  
*Dribbed*."My Neece Plantagenet": A Note on *Richard III*, IV, i. 1-2 (R. Withington), pp. 403-05.

Two Occasional Pastoral Poems by John Oldmixon (J. B. Anderson), pp. 406-07.

An Absurdity in *King Lear*? (Carroll Camden, Jr.), pp. 408-09.

Note on the blinding of Gloucester.

The Date of *Wit and Wisdom* (W. W. Greg), p. 410.

1579, not 1570.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
Vol. XLVII., December 1932—Edward Gibbon and Georges Deyverdun, collaborators in the  
*Mémoires Littéraires de la Grande Bretagne* (V. P. Helming),  
pp. 1028-49.

## REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. X., December 1932—

Milton, Guilpin et Marston (Paul Reyher), pp. 137-39.  
*Skialetheia*, *Il Penseroso*, and *The Scourge of Villainy*.

Keats and Fanny Brawne (S. B. Ward), pp. 139-43.

Miss Brawne's letter to Charles Brown.

Sur un passage des *Newcomes* (A. Barbeau), pp. 143-44.  
Chapter XXXV.

## February 1933—

W. M. Thackeray, l'homme, le penseur, le romancier (R. Las Vergnas),  
pp. 218-26.

Sur un vers de Donne (Suite) (Pierre Legouis), pp. 228-30.

*Second Anniversary*, I. 198.

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXX., January 1933—

The York and Towneley Plays on *The Harrowing of Hell* (Chester G. Curtiss), pp. 24-33.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 255

Elements in the Composition of *King Lear* (Madeleine Doran), pp. 34-58.

Japan and the *New Atlantis* (D. W. Thompson), pp. 59-68.

The voyage of William Adams to Japan.

The Sources of Richard Brome's *The Novella* (R. B. Sharpe), pp. 69-85.

The Influence of Contemporary Criticism on George Eliot (Mathilde Parlett), pp. 103-32.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, October 6, 1932—

The Preamble to *The Prelude* (W. G. Fraser), p. 711.

Reference in Book VII, l. 4, to the "preamble" to *The Recluse*.

*Pericles*, II, i, 119-21 (Percy Z. Round), p. 711.

Further note, October 13, p. 734.

A Book of Keats's (Willard B. Pope), p. 711.

*Essays in Rhyme*, by Jane and Ann Taylor.

Robert Greene's *Notable Discovery of Coosenage* (R. Pruvost), p. 716.

Bibliographical notes of early editions.

A Sequel to Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* (Lewis M. Knapp), p. 716.

*Brambleton Hall*.

— October 13—

Waller in Exile (Ella T. Riske), p. 734.

Letter to Evelyn from Rouen.

Oxford History (W. G. Hiscock), p. 734.

Performance of Saunders' *Tamerlane the Great* before Charles II, March 20, 1681.

Raleigh's Last Poem (H. Bibas), p. 734.

MS. copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Note on the history of the poem, by N. Ault, October 27, p. 789.

— October 20—

The Text of Keats (M. R. Ridley), p. 761.

Corrections in the *Letters*. Note by W. S. Robertson, November 3, p. 815; reply by M. R. Ridley, November 10, p. 839.

Chaucer's "Hodge of Ware" (Edith Rickert), p. 761.

Possible identification.

Darcy and Mr. Blackall (David Rhydderch), p. 762.

Reply by R. W. Chapman, November 3, p. 815.

— October 29—

*The Wife of Rossetti* (Helen Rossetti Angeli), p. 789.

Correction of statements in Miss Hunt's book.

Chaucer's Reeve (Lilian J. Redstone), pp. 789-90.

Chaucer's connection with Baldeswell.

"Gone West" (R. L. G. Ritchie), p. 790.

Origin and early uses. Further notes by G. V. Hart, November 3, p. 815; by R. Nichols and H. A. Lowless, November 10, p. 839; by J. Crofts, November 24, p. 903; by E. Armour, December 22, p. 977.

Charlotte Brontë (O. F. M.), p. 790.  
Contemporary reference.

**TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 3, 1932—**

Haemony (*Comus* 616-648) (J. H. Hanford), p. 815.  
Suggested identification of the Shepherd Lad with Milton.

Crashaw's Residence at Peterhouse (Austin Warren), p. 815.  
Evidence of Buttery books.

De Quincey's Punctuation of Wordsworth's "Cintra" (J. E. Wells),  
p. 815.

Henry Vaughan, Silurist (Gwenllian E. F. Morgan), p. 815.  
Autobiographical references.

— November 17—

The Text of Pepys (F. McD. C. Turner), p. 859.  
Accuracy of Smith's transcription.

Chaucer and the Treasurer of Calais (Edith Rickert), p. 859.  
Exchequer writs of 1375.

Dunghill: peasant: slave (Ross D. Waller), p. 859.  
*Peirs Gaveston and Hamlet*.

— November 24—

"Stalls and places in the Orchestra" (M. St. Clare Byrne), p. 888.  
Evidence of playbills from 1828 onwards.

The Life of Burns (John Muir), p. 903.  
Correction of details in Mr. Snyder's work.

— December 1—

Boswell and the Copyright of the Life (E. K. Willing-Denton),  
p. 923.

The separate printing of the "Letter to Lord Chesterfield" and the  
"Conversation with George III"—its purpose and result.

"The Rossetti Family" (Ross D. Waller), p. 923.  
Correction of text of letter of Pietrocola-Rossetti with reference to Gabriele  
Rossetti and the Roman Catholic Church.

Thomas Southerne (R. D. Mallory), p. 923.  
Entries of registration of birth and of admission to the Middle Temple.  
Further corrections of inaccuracies in the *D.N.B.*, Clifford Leech, December  
8, p. 943.

— December 8—

Tennyson and the Origins of the Golden Treasury (B. Ifor Evans),  
p. 941.  
Evidence of the manuscript.

A Lost Dramatic Document (G. E. Bentley), p. 943.  
Schedule of plays presented at Court in 1638-1639.

Chaucer called to Account (Edith Rickert), p. 943.  
Reference in records of June 1385.

ella),

.

on),

the

riels

uple.  
nber

ns),